# BRAHMAVADA

## THE SYSTEM OF SHUDDHADVAITA VEDANTA OF SRI VALLABHACHARYA

BY

RAGHUNATH SHARMA

# THE

# SYSTEM OF ŚUDDHĀDVAITA VEDĀNTA

# OF

# ŚRĪ VALLABHACARYA

(The System which is otherwise known as)

# BRAHMAVĀDA

A

THESIS

Submitted to

M. S. UNIVERSITY OF BARODA,

BARODA.

By

Ragu Nath Sharma, M.A.

Under the Guiadnce of

Late Prof. G. H. Bhatt, M.A.

and

Dr. A. N. Jani, M.A., Ph.D.

Baroda

1968

Published by :
Shri Rughunath Goswami
Manu Bhuvan,
Bhagatsinh Road,
Vileparle (West), BOMBAY-400 056

Copies : 500

Year : 1992

Printed by :
**Narottan Bhatia**
Praful Jyoti, Jawahar Road,
Ghatkopar (E), BOMBAY 400 077
Phone : 513 18 13.

## OPINION

I am pleased to see that the Ph. D. thesis of Goswami Shri Raghunathāji Maharaj is made avāilable in print.

The thesis entitled "The system of Śuddhādvaita Vedant of Śri Vallabhācārya" was submitted to the M. S. University of Baroda in 1968 and the degree of Ph. D. was awarded in 1968.

Shri Raghunathāji Maharaj was originally registered under the guidance of my Guru Prof. G. H. Bhatt. But due to his sudden death, the pleasant task of guiding the Goswami came to me by God's grace. In fact Goswamiji hails from the illustrious family of Śri Mahaprabhuji himself belonging to the seventh house of Kamvan. As such my work was very easy. Again the well known scholar and an authority on the philosophy of Śri Vallabhācarya-viz. Prof. N. K. Bambhania was his guide incognito. The present work is an authentic source of information about the Brahmavāda of H. H. Mahāprabhuji.

I congratulate Goswamiji when presenting an authentic exposition of the philosophy of Śri Vallabhācāryaji in five chapters.

The value of the present work is further enhanced by my friend Shri S. N. Bambhania, the worthy son of Prof. N. K. Bambhania, by adding an introductory preface about the author and by giving useful appendice at the end.

The present work is a useful and authentic exposition of the Śuddhādvaita philosophy. I therefore recommend that a Gujarāti version of the present work which would prove highly useful and valuable work among of vaishnavas, especially the ladies and other not conversant with the English language.

I am sure this work will be warmly received by the scholars as well as common people.

Baroda
22-12-91

Sd/-
**A. N. Jani**

## PARICĀYIKĀ

It is a matter of great pleasure for the publication of the thesis titled :

"The system of Śuddhādvaita vedānta of Śri Vallabhācārya's, otherwise known as Brahmavāda" by Dr. Raghunath Sharma, submitted to The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda (Gujarat State India) for the award of Ph. D. degree in the year 1968.

The scholar is popularly known as Goswāmī Shri Raghunathlālji Maharaj—the younger son of the worthy father : the Late Goswami 108 Shri Ramanlalji Mahārāj—the saptmeśa among the Puṣṭimāgīya Vaiṣnava sect and he is direct-male descendants of Śrī Viṭṭhaleśji-the younger son of Mahāprabhu Śrimad Vallabhācārya.

Śrīmad Vallabhācārya was born in the latter half of the fifteenth century and contributed to the religious and moral upliftment of the society in his time. At his credit is one of his noblest contribution in the extension of Brahmavāda-popularly known as Śuddhādvaita-Pure Monism the vedic school of philosophy by his literary work such as Aṇubhāṣya-a critical commentary on Brahma Sūtra-Aphorisms of Bādarāyaṇa Vyās, the commentary Subodhinī, on several parts of Śrimad Bhāgavata Purāṇa and various other literary original works.

He established and propagated Akhaṇda Brahmavāda, which was afterwards popularised as 'Suddhādvaita', in which the vedāntic principle 'Brahman' and is termed as Kṛisṅa. Sevā has been preached as the best ideal of a follower human being.

For such a noble contribution, led with pious life, Śrīmad Vallabhācārya was highly honoured as the fifth great Vedantācārya alongwith the four great others : nāmely Śrī Śaṁkarācārya, Śrī Rāmānujācārya, Srī Nimbārākacārya and Śri Mādhvācārya. All are respected as incarnations of Deities, and enjoy the high respect in the Indian Society.

Srimad Vallabhācārya also enjoys this height of the respect as "Mahāprabhu Vallabhācārya" among Vaiṣṇavas in particular and among the Indian Society in general and a very large number of persons follow His sect.

With this background about the scholar in short, let us have a brief sketch about this work.

The subject-matter has been discussed at a considerable length with the logical presentation of Sruti-quotations and the experiences of the great personalities of the modern age. The effort is directed towards the better understanding about the currents of knowledge-flowing in the oriental form of religion, and in the Western part of the world-in the form of sciences, and for the synthesis of them for the great cause of humanity.

The subject matter is presented into five main chāpters :

The preface starts with the supplimentary character of science and religion-through, with the contributions of the great personalities from both, and the subject comes out from the thought of Swami Ramtirth from his lecture at Tokyo-Japan.

In the introductory chapter rational view for the subjective discussion has been expressed; as the lack of the proper understanding of both, imperfect and adverse understanding resulting into the fanatic practices have created unnecessary quarrels among the follower groupṣ, resulting into tensions and disturbunces in mankind.

On the contrary, the aims of the pioneers are towards the total welfare of man-kind; and hence the proper understanding becomes essential. In practice the followers should refrain themselves from abusing the principles of the others-which are not properly known to them; and both sides should suppliment their efforts to strive for the noble cause of the world peace and the welfare of the man-kind. The acknowledgement to the guide professors and other scholars and the notes on the frame-work of the thesis appear in the latter part.

The second chapter deals with the chief authority on which Śrī Vallabhācārya relies. It has been pointed out towards the existance of the Unifying Principle-conveniently termed as God and with many other names also. Sense organs have limitations for the realisation of God, and hence Scriptural Authority and the experiences of saints are recognised as authoritative for this subject; by the orthodox as well as the modern scholars both. As the logic itself has its own limitations, rational interpretation of scriptures becomes essentiāl. The unique position of Guru-the spiritual guide has also been emphasised as essential towards the initiation in the direction of the realisation. Experiences of the greatmen stand in support.

The third chapter deals with the secondless One, the Ultimate Reality. Definition of the term, upniśadic supports to the same, experiences of the saints like Mahatma Gandhi and scientists like Sir C. V. Raman and how it is known and felt are discussed.

The omnipresence, Omniscient and Omnigood characters are discussed with the support of rational arguments. The necessity of the faith-as the rational foundation and the Divine Grace are the necessary means towards the Realisation.

The Oneness-without second-character has been discussed with the help of worldly simple examples. Each character : intelligent, powerful, kind, goodness, omnipresence-etc. of the Ultimate Reality, the fact of the creation of the world, material cause and instrumental cause-both in one, and the explanations of the other Ācaryās have been compared through the discussion at a fair length.

In the fourth chapter various other aspects such as : 'infinite' diverse names and forms, sat cidānanda forms, this miraculous powers, personal and impersonal character, three Guṇas-Sattva, Rajas, Tamas, are discussed. Views of other Ācaryas are also discussed. The views of Śrīmad Vallabhācārya have also been compared with the views of Śrī Aurobindo Ghosh. Because of the rational conception about Ultimate Reality, and its effect on the Indian religion resulted into tolerance-are also pointed out. The discussion

has the support of the laws of thoughts. The creation of this world is the manifestation of the Ultimate Reality, as a mere sport.

In the fifth chapter animate souls, inanimate objects, their participation in this divine play, a short hint to the ideal life of Śrimad Vallabhācārya and his worthy son Śri Vitthaleśa have been pointed out with the final conclusion of the subject in the last chapter of recapitulation.

Appendices are framed in the supports of the discussions, and the abbreviations of the sources.

The original literature on the subject appears in Sanskrit and Vrajabhāśā–an old dilectic form of Hindi, which has remained a predominent and common current language in India and nowadays it has also been published in the provincial languages of India like Gujarati etc..

In order to make this publication more useful, detailed contents of the index, subject index and quotation-index have been framed for the ease of reference work.

Ours are the efforts of human limitation, but presented into His divine lotus-feet of the Almighty Ultimate Reality, just as a small petal of flower. May he accept and kindly look at.

Mahāprabhu Śrimad Vallabhācaryaji Śri Vitthalnāthji, the descendents and also their pious followers will kindly favour us forgetting our errors if any.

(S. N. BAMBHANIA)
SHANTILAL N. BAMBHANIA
M. Sc. M. Phd. (1st class)
LL. B.

"Champaranya"
Opp. Akashdip flats
Behind Khadayta Colony,
Ellisbridge, Ahmedabad-6

## PREFACE

**All the mundaine phenomena are the transcendental supreme self. He, the Supreme Being, is the creator & He creates Himself only. He, the Supreme Self, is the sustainer & He sustains Himself only. He, the Supreme Lord, is the destroyer & He destroys Himself only (1).**

**Whenever, however, wherever, by or through whatever, out of whatever, for whatever, of whatever, to whatever; in the material form or conscious form or divine form, whatever happens-it is all in all the Lord Himself (2).**

The above quoted two passages sound like a poetry, but they are not written merely to give an expression to a devotional imagination of a poet. Rather they should be regarded as a great poem that strives to synthesise the different intellectual philosophies that bewilder our mind with mutual contradictions. And this synthesis too is not a subterfuge to subjugate or enfold the other systems of philosophy, into one's own system of thought, for making a claim of being all-encompassing universal philosophy. These two passages are from the writings of Mahāprabhu Śrī Vallabhācārya, the revivalist of the Shuddhādvaita Brahmavāda system of Vedānta.

Mahāprabhu's sole interest in this framework of philosophical system lies in it's usefulness to meet the demand of devotion par excellence for the Lord Kṛṣṇa. According to Mahāprabhu, this devotion is neither merely a divine relishment of the godhood of Kṛṣṇa nor is it merely a realisation of the all-pervasive powers or attributes of the Brahman. For Mahāprabhu, Kṛṣṇa is both a divine person as well as an omnificient-omnipresent-omnicient & omnipotent power. Therefore, according to Mahāprabhu, an ideal devotee has to relish Brahman as Kṛṣṇa and realise Kṛṣṇa as Brahman (3).

Mahāprabhu says—"This world is to be realised as a part or a form of God but it should not be relished as God (4)."

We, certainly, cannot relish any single musical note but any two musical notes of mutally contradictory sounds indeed come into a charmful harmony in a sweet song!

For Mahāprabhu, Kṛṣṇa is both; transcendental & immanent too. He is the supreme Being Consciousness & Bliss. He is all-pervasive, therefore system of Suddhādvaita Vedānta is also a pursuit of understanding how His all-pervasive unity encompasses all the possible phenomena proposed by the other systems of thought. They are suppossed as either power or form identical with the essence of the Supreme Being (5).

Yes, the God is all-pervasive, therefore, in every vision of divinity, some divine perspective is present (6).

According to some thinkers, though the two tracks of train never truely converge, yet the law of perspective produces such subjective feelings within us. Thus what we see is merely an illusion & the said law amply proves the ultimate falsity & visual experience.

As a matter of fact, in spite of the absence of any mental, subjective or cognitive activity, the law of perspective maintains it's own objective validity. This is adequately supported by the photographic reproduction of any landscape by a camera, which does not possess mind. Therefore, truely speaking, the so called law of perspective is not so much concerned with how do we perceive, but how a visual object appears in spatial relation with the other objects. Because the visual object appears exactly in similar fashion before both : the eyes of conscious being as well as the lens of lifeless camera. This takes us for considering one more important issue of the Kantian duality between 'the thing as it is' & 'the thing as it appears'.

Here, according to different Vedāntic theories viz. Vivartavāda, Vikṛta-pariṇāmavāda & Avikṛta-pariṇāmavāda, we get the different solutions.

The Kevalādvaitins propose Vivartavāda. Therfore according to it, Adhisthāna i.e. 'the thing as it is' is absolutely one : [A & not-(not-A) ]. Thus 'the thing as it appears' is a false appearence, as the serpent falsely appears on the rope due to darkness, resemblence & the fear of serpent in person who perceives it.

The other possibility is of Vikṛta-parināmavāda. According to it, 'the thing as it is' e.g. milk, after being modified as curd, truely appears to be curd. But after the modification i.e., from milk to curd, if someone misconsiders the curd as milk, nobody would admit such consideration as valid knowledge.

Therefore Mahaprabhu proposes a different theory of Avikṛta-pariṇāmavāda, wherein substance & it's modifications are identical with each other, as in the philosophy of Spinoza. Therefore 'the thing as it is' is unknowable in manner of 'the thing as it appears,' before it is modified in that particular form. But if in the process of modification, the essential identity is not lost, then the relation between 'the thing as it is' & 'the thing as it appārs' cannot be defined in terms of [ A & not-(not-A) ], but it has to be defined in terms (A=B). Here 'A' stands 'the thing as it is' & 'B' stands for 'the thing as it appears'.

Mahaprabhu supports his theory by giving the example of the gold & the necklace made of it. To give a little clear explaination, we can also think of an antique statue made of gold. To an ignorent goldthief, it may appear simply as a gold & to a historian as an antique of much higher value than a mere piece of gold. Neither of these two appearences can be explained away in terms Adhisthan & Vivarta. Therefore the relation that subsists between the substance gold & the antique statue cannot be explained in terms of considering the gold as a real substance & statue as a false modification.

Thus the Brahman, before being modified as the world is unknowable-indescribable 'the thing as it is' in very Kantian fashion.

But after being modified as the world; as gold is modified into the form of an antique or an ornament, it really becomes the world knowable as well as describable. The Brahman becomes the world without loosing it's essential identity. Therefore 'the thing as it is' viz. Brahman is identical with 'the thing as it appears' viz. the world..

According to Kevalādvaitins, it can be argued that an absolutely real thing can never go under the process of any changes. But we have to consider the whole issue more carefully.

For the sake of argument, think of any object which is merely phenomenally real, with all of it's changes also being of same nature, e.g. the transformation of milk into curd. Here the milk as well as it's transformation both are phenomenally real. So there is no need to degrade the changes to the scale lower than that of the substance which undergoes the transformation. It is not the case here that the milk is noumenally real while it's transformation into curd is phenomenally real. Nor milk can be regarded as phenomenally real while the curd as mere false appearence. A question of temporal distinction can be brought into notice for emphasising the duality between the milk as it was & the milk as it, after the changing into form of curd, appears. In such case, we would like to propose to concentrate upon the nature of the quantam theory : light is both wave as well as particles. Here in this case, what can be regarded as the light as it is & the light as it appears ?

Therefore it is inevitable here to make one more distinction as to between what 'the thing as it is' is & what 'the human logic demands the thing to be' is.

The laws of thought are the prime necessity for any intellectual thinking; but can our intellect be regarded as the sole criterion of objective reality ? We certainly can not intellectually grasp how something being wave can be particles too. We have simply to observe or presume how the light behaves surrationally !

Mahāprabhu Sri Vallabhācārya considers Brahman also a supra-rational phenomenon i.e. neither rational nor irrational one.

Mahāprabhu emphatically clarifies that Brahman is all, therefore it is full of mutually contradictory attributes. Such phenomenon can sometimes be misunderstood as irrational concept, but this is merely a blind faith in reason. As a matter of fact, Brahman is supra-rational phenomenon, therefore, all philosophies can be regarded as describing some partial truth of Brahman. At the same time, no philosophy can be a total description of the totallity of the truth : एकैको वादो ब्रह्मण एकैकधर्मप्रतिपादकैकवाक्यशेष इति भगवान् तान् सर्वानेव अनुसरति.

Mahāprabhu, therefore, also confirms that any absolutestic claim of any philosophy is bound to be absolutely false. Yet even in this respect, Mahāprabhu's opinion is that even such absolutely false approach is ultimately caused or inspired by the God Himself, nay never by setan !

Mahāprabhu says–"Although all the understandings i.e. philosophies are caused or inspired by the God but the thinkers, due to ignorance of the God, uphold their respective systems of thought as the full & final description of the ultimate reality. Some think –there is no God, others think–actions or rituals alone are God, some consider Him as 'mere creator' while other consider Him nothing else than their owneselves. These totallistic claims are prevalent due to ignorence & total reliance upon their own hypothyses (8)". This means that there is some truth in every theory of different systems of thought.

In brief, this is the approach of Mahāprabhu Śrī Vallabhācārya's philosophy. It is very unlike the approach of Śūnyavādins who say that the theory of Śūnya is not to uphold the Sūnya as the ultimate reality, but to get rid of all the theories, including itself about the ultimate reality. Mahāprabhu upholds the theory of Brahmavāda not to falsify other theories, least can it be said to be for self-denial. For Mahāprabhu, Brahman is full of contradictory attributes, therefore all the contradictory theories are partially true including his own theory of Śuddhādvait Brahmavāda.

I am glad that Goswāmy Sri Raghunathlāl (Dādābhāi)'s Ph. D. thesis is being published. It gives quite lucid exposition of the philisophy of Mahāprabhu & I have no doubt that it will enhence the interest in the readers of different systems of Vedānta.

14th March, 92 —**Goswāmy Śyammanohar**
Bombay

---

1. From Sarvanirnaya Nibandha of Mahāprabhu Srı Vallabhācarya : "आत्मैव तदिदं सर्वं ... हरतीश्वर:
2. From Sastrārth Nibandha of Mahāprabhu : "यत्रयेन....प्रधानपुरुषेश्वर:"
3. Sastrartha : "माहात्म्यज्ञानपूर्वस्तु...स्नेहो भक्ति:"
4. From Subodhini by Mahāprabhu : ब्रह्मरूपं जगद्...न तत्रासक्ति:
5. Siddhāntamuktavali by Mahāprabhu : परं ब्रह्म तु कृष्णो...श्रुतेर्भतम्."
6. Subodhini
7. Sastrārtha : "एकैको वादो...अनुसरति."
8. Subodhini

## OBLIGATORY

I am delighted to thank Mahārājā Sayājirāo University of Baroda for the kind permission for the printing and publication of my Thesis.

I can not help acknowledgeing the indebtedness to my brother Śri Śyam Manoharji the worthy son of my honourable Guru Śri Dixitaji Mahārāj of Badā Mandir Bombay for his proper guidance and also performing the editorial and proofreading work in spite of remaining very busy in the several pious activities of Vallabha Sampradāya.

I am highly obliged to the late prof. N. K. Bāmbhaniā H. K. College Ahmedabad for his guidance and as a result my thesis has seen the light of the day,

I am also thankful to Padmaśrī Mahāmahimopādhyāya K. K. Śastri as well as the well known scholar Śri Badrināth Śāstri for giving valuable suggestions time to time.

Heartily thanking to S. N. Bāmbhania for preparing the Parichayikā, the detailed Contents of the index, the subject index, the quotation-index and the index of maxims for the ease of reference work of my Thesis.

Finally my hearty blessings to Sri Narottam Bhātia for the printing job of my Thesis.

I am sure that my humble endeavour will be warmly received by the people all over the world. I dedicate this petal of my Thesis in the lotus feet of Sri Madanmohan Prabhu.

To end in good my inexhaustible prostrations before my graceful Śri Madanmohanji, Śri Vallabhācārryacarna, Śri Vithaleśwaraprabhu, Śri Ghanśyām-Prabhu as well as honourable parents of mine.

—**Raghunath Goswami**

## DETAILED CONTENTS

| | | | Page |
|---|---|---|---|
| Part–1 | Paricayika Opinions | | |
| Part–2 | Thesis | | |
| | Preface : | | |
| | | Supplimentary character of science and religion | 1 |
| Chapt.–I | Introduction | | 3–7 |
| Para–1–2 | Pioneer's aims and efforts | | 3 |
| 3 | One spirit behind all religions | | 4 |
| 4,5,4 | Conclusion | | 5 |
| 7 | Points of technical importance | | 7 |
| Chapt–II | Authority | | 8–33 |
| Para–1 | Chief authority. & Field of philosophy | | 8 |
| 2–3 | Field of scienees | | 9 |
| 4 | Ancient views | | 10 |
| 5 | Efforts of scholars and spiritual scientists | | 11 |
| 6 | 'God' a term for unity | | 12 |
| 7 | Rational view | | 12 |
| 8 | Orthodox view Words of God or prophets as the only means | | 13 |
| 9 | Positive views on the subject | | 13 |
| 10–11 | 'Guru' the spiritual | | 14 |
| 12 | guide–and initiation | | |
| 13 | To be a better follower | | 16 |
| 14–15 | Bādarāyan, indespensability of revelation | | 17 |
| 16 | Vedas–as absolute authority–orthodox view | | 18 |
| 17 | Other three works | | 18 |

| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 18-19 | Rationalistic view and beliefs | 19 |
| 20 | Conflicting views in science and religion | 20 |
| 21 | Conflicts among varions religions | 21 |
| 22 | Rationality and need of tolerence in behaviors | 24 |
| 23 | Limitations of one set of Laws to others | 25 |
| 24 | Need of faith. | 27 |
| 25 | Faith in belief | 29 |
| 26 | Need to accept the genuine portion of scriptures | 30 |
| 27,28,29 | Vallabhācārya's Attitude towords scriptural authority | 31 |
| Chapt-III | Ultimate Reality | [34-61] |
| Para-1 | Brahmavāda-def. | 34 |
| 2, 3 | 'God'-theological term, detailed discussion rely on vedic scriptures | |
| 4 | 'Śuddhadvait' def. | 35 |
| 5 | Upaniṣads-support | 35 |
| 6 | Enlighten human mind as source | 36 |
| 7 | Ultimate Principle-intelligent, powerful and kind | 38 |
| 8 | Experiences of renowned persons | 39 |
| 9 | Bible supports | 40 |
| 10 | Known by mental apparatus | 40 |
| 11 | Dogmatic-methods by Indian philosophers | 42 |
| 12 | Nothing more beyond this to know | 43 |
| 13 | Knowledge as power | 44 |
| 14 | Combination-of knowledge and power | 44 |
| 15 | Goodness | 44 |
| 16 | Omnipresence | 45 |
| 17 | Faith | 45 |
| 18-19 | Vallabhācārya's view | 47 |
| 20 | God-one without second | 47 |
| 21 | Discussion on Onenness | 48 |
| 22 | Without second | 49 |
| 23-24 | Fact of creation, details | 50 |

| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 25 | Material and instrumental cause.. | 51 |
| 26 | " | |
| 27 | " | |
| 28 | " | |
| 29 | Problem of evil | 56 |
| 30 | Diflerent views | 56 |
| 31 | Vallabhācārya's solution | 57 |
| 32 | Partiality or cruelty | 59 |
| 33 | Supports | 60 |
| 34 | Summary | 60 |
| Chap-IV Other Aspects | | 62–96 |
| Para-1 | Various Aspects | 62 |
| 2-3 | Infinite-all comprehensive | 63 |
| 4 | Diverse-names and forms | 70 |
| 5 | Sac-ĉid-ānand | 71 |
| 6 | Many foldness | 72 |
| 7 | Miraculous powers | 74 |
| 8 | Śamkarācārya's view | 77 |
| 9 | Rāmānujacārya's view | 81 |
| 10-11 | Vallabhācārya's basis and view | 83 |
| 12 | Endowed with all divine qualities | 90 |
| 13 | Ultimate Reality as personal and Impersonal | 92 |
| 14 | Creation of this World is mere sport | 96 |
| Chap-V Two Sub-catagories | | 98-100 |
| Para-1 | Animate souls and Inanimate objects | 98 |
| 2 | Souls-active or contemplative : life ideally lead by Vallabhācārya and Vitthaleśa | 99 |
| Chap-VI Recapitulation | | 101-102 |
| Para-1 | One Religion | 101 |
| 2 | God all comprehensive simplicity | 101 |
| 3 | Master simplicity transformed into vast complexity | 102 |

| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| Part-3 | | |
| — | Appendix I<br>Persons and Authours | 103 |
| — | Appendix II<br>Abbreviations & Books | 105 |
| – | Appendix III<br>Sources of Quotations<br>Subject Index<br>Quotation-Index | 109 |
| Subject Index | | 113 |
| Index of Inalation | | 123 |
| Proverbs and Numinous | | 124 |

## PREFACE

Fortunately, there have appeard men, both in the East as well as in the West, who have appreciated and absorbed the Cultures of both the East and the West; e.g. Svāmī Vivekānanda and Svāmī Rāmā Tīrtha in the East, and Romain Rolland and Aldous Huxley in the West. The general Culture of the West values the matter more than the Spirit, that of the East values the Spirit more than the matter. But our body has both. They are like our two eyes. We can carry on our work with one eye no doubt; but for the sake of full perspective and also for that of beauty and symmetry both are needed. In the Materialistic Culture of the West, we have the spirit of adventure, the element of honest, incessant labour, the open-eyed rationalistic bent of mind, and in short, all the qualities needed for materialistic progress. But at the same time, there is no consciousness of the One Spirit enthroned in the hearts of all. Thus, there is no sincere regard for others there in the West. If it is at all to be found, it is only as a means to an end, which is one's own materialistic gain. This is true atleast in case of those who no more share their traditional Christian or Jewesh faith. It is all right as long as it serves the latter. No sooner does it come in conflict with it, than it is thrown over-board. And, in consequence, there are cut-throat competition, mutual intolerance, and the mentality of destruction of the opponent. And these three are the great impediments in the way of Universal Peace, the avowed end of all. This lack to be found in the Materialistic Culture is supplied by the Spiritualistic Culture of the East. The same Spirit dwells in us as well as in others. This Spirit is One Mighty Organism and all living creatures whether human or sub-human are its various organs. They are like limbs of our body. The hand instinctively runs to the help of the leg if a mosquito sits on the latter to bite it. Some such instinctive help to others in their hour of need is needed for the Universal Peace, the avowed goal of all.

The rationale for some such regard for, and the consequent help to, others is supplied by the Spiritualistic Philosophy of the East. In a lecture on "The Secret of Success" at the College of Commerce in Tokyo, Svāmi Rāma Tirtha had said : "The Religion that Rāma brings to Japan is virtually the same as was brought centuries ago by Buddha's followers. **But the same religion requires to be dealt with from an entirely different standpoint, to suit it to the needs of the present age. It requires to blazoned forth in the light of Western Science and Philosophy."**[1] That the present Thesis is animated by this Spirit will be clear to any one who happens to read it. One Amrican News Paper had written about Svāmi Rāma Tirtha that he stood where philosophy and practical science met. Something of the sort can be said about this Thesis too.

---

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

1. A word about the way of treatment of the subject, which is not altogether untouched in the past, is at the outset not out of place.

2. The tremendous progress made by Positive Sciences, both physical as well as psychological, has shaken the very foundation of religious dogmas giving rise to the two opposite camps. Scientific fanatics have dubbed aside as blind belief anything and everything that cannot be demonstrated. Religious fanatics, on the other hand, owing to their mental inertia, have not only failed to grasp the true scientific spirit, but have left no stone unturned in persecuting any person who happened to profess a belief different from their own, regardless of the fact whether such a person pursued science or belonged to a different religion, or merely to a different denomination of their own religion. Their pioneers had delight in being persecuted by their opponents; these followers delighted in persecuting their opponents. The former loved and forgave their opponents; these latter had hated and harassed them. The result is the alienation of the best brains. It is not the religious pioneers but the religious fanatics that have brought Religion into disrepute. The new generation is not irreligious at heart. It has been made irreligious by religious persecutors of the past as well as the present. The common run of men looks to facts which are concrete and not to principles which are abstract. They think, if religious persons are bad, religions are bad. And thinking so they leave Religion altogether. And in leaving Religion in this way they are deprived of even the

best elements of Religion. There is nothing absolutely bad in either Religion or Science. What is bad is the ignorance of the true nature of both. What is bad is unwarranted belief. What is bad is hypocrisy and not sincerity in either. There is nothing nobler than sincerity. True Science and true Religion need fear nothing. Why should they ? Why should true light fear darkness ? Fearlessness is the foremost among divine virtues. If anything is to be feard it is fear itsel. True faith and fearlessness always go together. True faith is eternal. It is never shaken. "A faith which cannot survive collision with the truth is not worth many regrets" says A. C. Clarke, an eminent British scientist.[1]

3. There is a marked difference between a body and a soul. Though individual bodies die as a rule, the, soul animating them has survived through ages. And it is this continuity of the soul alone that can account for the steady progress of the human race. What is true of the individual bodies and the universal soul is equally true of the individual religions and the Universal Religious Spirit. Their outward forms constitute their bodies only. The inward animating Spirit is everywhere the same. That is why Dr. Rādhākṛishṇan has said somewhere in his inimitable style "Religions must die if Religion is to live."[2] By 'Religions' he means outward religious forms and beliefs. By 'Religion' he means the one Religious Spirit animating all individual religions. The importance of the outward body lies in so far as it embodies the inward soul. The outward body without the inward soul is dead subject to disintegration and decay. Fanatics are familiar only with the outward forms. Of the inward animating Spirit they know nothing. And it is only for the outward forms that they fight. The really faithful alone know what the inward animating Spirit is. The truly faithful followers of one religion never quarrel with those of another. They not only respect but also love each other. And this is always so in spite of the fact that on account of their different practices they cannot physically

mix together. And, incidentally it may be mentioned that, generally, just as there are no souls to be found without bodies, so there are no religions to be found without outward religious practices. And just as, in our general course, we do tolerate the bodies of other persons, so we ought to tolerate the outward practices of other religions. And the future Universal Religion is sure to take some such form. And it is the spirit of such Universal Religion that has inspired the following words of Svāmī Vivekānanda :

"I accept all religions that were in the past, and worship with them all; I worship God with any one of them ... We take in all that has been in the past, enjoy the light of the present, and open every window of the heart for all that will come in the future. Salutations to all the prophets of the past to all the great ones of the present, and to all that are to come in the future."[3] And it is just because, in the religious system of Śrī-Vallabhācārya, I have found the elementes of such a Universal Religion, that I have chosen it to be the subject of my Thesis. And since the rational and the universally acceptable presentation of his doctrines has been my sole aim, I have refrained from going into doctrinal details.

4. I cannot conclude this little Introduction without thankfully remembering my First Guide. late Prof. G. H. Bhatt, the Chief Editor of the Critical Edition of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa, published by Oriental Institute. Baroda. When I approached him and expressed my wish to write a thesis for my Ph. D. degree, his joy knew no bounds. It was he who very enthusiastically suggested the topic for my Thesis He was a sincere devotee of Śrī Vallabhācārya, of his philosophical and religious system, and of his works. This sincere devotion of his, though instinctive, was strongly nourished by his deep study thereof. If was his pious wish to present to the intelligent world the tenets of this great Vaiṣṇava Vedāntācārya, last in the line headed by such mighty personalities as Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya and Śrī-Rāmānujācārya. Though he is not as widely known

as these two great Ācāryas, he has all the qualities as would place him in their rank. He is original, rational, comprehensive, catholic yet very humble. He flourished during the last quarter of the fifteenth and the first quarter of the sixteenth century of the Christian Era. Like other Vedāntācāryas, he has to his credit a Bhāṣya on the Brahma-Sūtras, wherein we find a thoroughly well-formulated system of Vedāntic philosophy and religion. His crowning work, however, is his mighty and masterly commentary on Śrīmad-Bhāgavata. And this Śrīmad-Bhāgavata ranks in importance with Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata in Indian religious literature. He openly declares that it was to write this commentary that God had sent him to this world of mortals.[4] Moreover he openly declares that God appeared in person before him and asked him to propagate his faith.[5] Unfortunately, he could not write this commentary on the whole of that work because of the repeated orders from God to return. To these orders from God also he openly refers in one of his minor works.[6] That such phenomena are not unusual in India has been ably shown by Christopher Isherwood in his work "Ramakrishna and His Disciples." Srī-Vallabhācārya has a very vast number of followers even to-day. He was a householder; and the writer of the present Thesis has the great fortune of being his direct descendant, Among his descendants there have been many learned persons who have enriched the philosophical and religious literature of India.

5. Next, I have sincerely to thank Dr. A. N. Jānī, the Head of Sanskrit Department, the M. S. University of Baroda, who most sympathetically came to my help in my sad bereavement caused by the sudden death of my First Guide, Prof. G. H. Bhatt, by very willingly accepting to be my Guide in spite of his many pre-occupations, and thus amply facilitating my work.

6. Last but not the least, I cannot help acknowledging the deepest debt of gratitude I owe to Śrī-Dīkṣtajī Mahārāj

of Badā Mandir, Bombay, at present occupying a unique position among the direct descendants Śrī-Vallabhācārya, because of his profound scholarship in the field of Vedāntic philosophy. It is he who first initiated me into the philosophical tenets of Śrī-Vallabhācārya. It is he who has nourished me in this field as a mother does her child. And it is no exaggeration to state that it is through his sheer grace that the work of this Thesis has proceeded smoothly and that this Thesis has seen the light of the day. My thousand prostrations before this mighty Guru of mine.

7. Now, I can very well conclude this little Introduction by mentioning a few points of technical importance. The original Sanskrit Quotations have been given in translitertion, the scheme whereof is the one current among the Oriental Scholars of today. They have been given with a slight modification, so far as strict Sandhi-rules are concerned, in order to make them easily understandable. Mostly they are followed by a free, flowing, full, yet faithful rendering thereof. In some places, where their rendering and substance practically coincide, they are followed by their substance. But nowhere do they occur without their meaning being made clear. As to the Indication of the source of these as well as other quotations, it has been done separately in an Appendix and not where they occur, in order that the body of the Thesis may have a smooth appearance. The bold typed of certain important portions thereof plus the additional punctuation marks and the additional words put therein, one to emphasise and the other to make the sense clear, are entirely due to me. As to the presentation of the material, it has been throughout rational, at times proceeding from the very first principles. The language employed is simple and direct. Every effort has been made to make the meaning as clear as possible. As this work is intended for the general public, I have taken a little liberty with the use of certain philosophical terms, which the strict students of philosophy will kindly pardon.

---

## CHAPTER II

### AUTHORITY

1. The chief authority on which Śrī-Vallabhācārya relies for his System of Suddhādvaita Vedānta, otherwise known as Brahmavāda as contrasted with the Māyavāda as Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya, is undoubtedly the Vedas, especially the Upaniṣadic portions thereof. But before we deal with it, it will be well for us to consider certain general matters relating to this system. This system obviously belongs to the sphere of metaphysics, i.e., that branch of philosophy which deals with the Ultimate Principle. The phenomena presented to our sense are, as all thinkers know, impermanent; not only impermanent but also many. We know from our own experience that behind our thoughts which are both impermanent and many, there lies one permanent thinking subject. This tempts us to think that it is also possible that the external phenomena which are impermanent and many may also have one permanent principle behind them. In spite of this temptation in that direction we know it for certain that our external sense-organs never inform us about some such Ultimate Principle. Nevertheless the internal demand for some such Ultimate Principle is always there. Deep thinkers, past as well as present, have always tried to find out some such Principle unifying the diversified phenomena, which are not only many but at times even incoherent. Scientists in the external sphere and philosophers in the internal one have tried their level best to discover simple laws governing this diversified phenomena. And incidentally we may say that as history of Science and Philosophy clearly shows, their efforts have not been entirely wasted.

They have certainly met with some amount of success. But that is not our point here. The most material point here is the hankering after some such unifying principle. Take, for instance, what Dr. Annie Besant writes in her Autobiography :

"The first step which leaves behind the idea of a limited and personal God, an extra-cosmic Creator, and leads the student to the point whence Atheism and Pantheism diverge, is the recognition that a profonud unity of substance underlies the infinite diversities of natural phenomena, the discernment of the One beneath the Many. This was the step I had taken before my first meeting with Charles Bradlaugh, and I had written :

" It is manifest to all who will take the trouble to think steadily, that there can be only one eternal and underived substance, and that matter and spirit must, therefore, only be varying manifestations of this One substance. ...Matter is in its constituent elements, the same as spirit; existence is one, however manifold in its phenomena; life is one, however multiform in its evolution. As the heat of the coal differs from the coal itself, so do memory, perception, judgment, emotion, and will differ from the brain which is the instrument of thought. But nevertheless they are all equally products of the one sole substance varying only in their conditions."[1]

2. Leaving this abstract field of philosophy, if we come down to the concrete field of physical science, it has been demonstrated beyond all doubt that all matter, however diversified in its manifestations, is ultimately constituted of the same elementary particles.

3. From what has been stated above it will be amply clear that the enlightened human soul in its innermost depth hankers after some simplicity likely to underlie the vast complexity of the universe, external as well as internal. And what simplicity can there be other than unity? It is in this way that

we can arrive at unity instinctively. And Śuddhādvaita means nothing else but unity pure and simple. But will this instinctive approach suffice ? Will it satisfy rational thinkers, whose motto is "No trusting without testing" and who in this age of universal doubt would take nothing for granted ? So let us see if we can find anything pointing out in this direction.

4. For this let us first turn to physicists and their latest theory and about the constitution of matter. Some of the Greek philosophers, like their oriental counterparts, the Vaiśeṣikas, believed that atoms are the ultimate constituents of matter. But this belief of theirs was instinctive rather than scientific in the modern sense of the term. The latest scientific research has, however, confirmed this view of theirs. Nevertheless, their approach was not strictly scientific; so let us turn to modern scientists, especially, physicists. These latter study the constitution and the working of the external universe. Their attitude is strictly objective. They have no preconceived notions to mislead them. Their sincerity is beyond reproach. Their sacrifice of material comforts is almost ascetic. They proceed with as fer assumptions as possible. They have built their theoretical structure on a few fundamental laws of thought and the solid facts which repeatedly and invariably present themselves before their sense-organs and their instruments which are perfectly faultless. They are precise to a point. They believe first in what is unmistakably presented before them, and next in that without which what they have thus observed cannot be satisfactorily explained. For instance, Newton, the Sage among Scientists, believed in the falling down of an apple and in the gravitational pull by the earth without which the phenomenon of this falling down of the apple could not be satisfactorily explained. And even when he extended his theory of gravitation to other parts of the universe, every step of his was strictly cautious. He went on, no doubt, but strictly checking every step of his.

Coming to the point, let us see to what this strictly scientific method has brought them. Their latest discoveries point to the fact that all external matter is ultimately constituted of elementary particles, which are nothing but a form of energy, thus establishing that matter and energy are in the ultimate analysis but one, and thus substantiate what the ancient philosophers had roughly arrived at instinctively or speculatively.

5. When, however, we come to the sphere of what is within, both our hands and tongues are tied. We have no scientists and research scholars worth the name. Such philosophers as Aldous Huxley had tried to explore this field. But they had not advanced sufficiently enough to demonstrate the results of their research. At best they could only hold forth rational explanations for spiritual beliefs. Such explanations may to some extent satisfy spiritually-minded persons. Nevertheless, their appeal is certainly not universal. It is being reported that Yogins have achieved considarable progress in the internal sphere. But, unfortunately, they do not come out in public. If some venture to come out, they miserably fail. We may have at times a solitary instance of a true spiritual scientist like Svāmı Śrı-Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahaṁsa, the Guru of Svāmi Vivekānanda. But such instance are very very rare. That he was a real spiritual scientist was amply clear to those that had come in personal contact with him. He repeatedly warned his disciples never to take anything on trust. Svāmı Vivekānanda was the last man to take anything on trust. So steeped was he in western speculative philosophy. Not only had Svāmı Srı-Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahaṁsa repeatedly asked Svāmı Vivekānanda to test him (i.e., Svāmı Śrı-Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahaṁsa), but the latter had actually tested the former, and the former had come out of that test unscathed. Coming to the point, we, in the present state of things, in all humility admit our weakness in this sphere; and in spite of our desire to the contrary, we have

to rely, unwillingly of course, on the views of ancient masters. Nevertheless, we shall, in this matter, be as rational as possible, and perhaps the least dogmatic.

6. As stated above our philosophical instinct points in the direction of Ultimate Unity, whereas our intellect refuses to believe in it. For we perceive diversity everywhere. This is not the only thing. The dictum "Variety is the spice of life" shows its desirability too. Moreover, without this diversity, all our course of conduct would come to a standstill. We cannot conceive how any activity would at all be possible without this diversity. To make dealing possible we are, moreover, compelled to create diversity where there is none : e.g. in the case of currency notes of the same denomination which are all alike, we have to number them and thus create diversity; or, in the case of oceanic water which is the same everywhere, we have to demarcate it in different continental parts. Is, then, Unity the Ultimate Principle or Diversity? Incidentally it may be mentioned that the quarrel whether anything like God exists or does not exist is a hight of folly. For, after all, 'God' is a convenient term for some such unifying Ultimate Principle. Moreover, let it be mentioned that this term 'God' will be freely employed in the sense of this unifying Ultimate Principle whenever and wherever it will be felt convenient to do so in this dissertation.

7. That reason by itself cannot lead us to such an Ultimate Principle, convenientlv termed 'God', is clear not only to orthodox philosophers but also to clear-headed sincere free-thinkers, Take, for instance, the following excerpt from Dr. Annie Besant's Autobiography, Before she became an ardent. Theosophist, she was a devout disciple of Charles Bradlaugh, a British free-thinker of spotless character and of highly noble nature. She writes :

"Proceeding to search whether any idea of God was attainable, I came to the conclusion that evidence of the existence

of a conscicus Power was lacking, and that the ordinary proofs offered were inconclusive; that we could grasp phenomena and no more. ...Our faculties fail us when we try to estimate the Deity, and we are betrayed into contradictions and ab-surdities.

"This refusal to believe without evidence, and the declaration that anything 'behind phenomena' is unknowable to man as at present constituted — these are the two chief planks of the Atheistic platform, as Atheism was held by Charles Bradlaugh and myself."[2]

8. Now, let us see what an orthodox philosopher, our Sūtrakāra Śrī-Bādrāyaṇa Vyāsa, has to say on the point. In his Tarkāpratiṣṭhāna Sūtra[3] he has categorically declared that so far as the search of the Ultimate Principle is concerned the human reason by itself is futile. Objects are of two types-those that lie within the range of sense-organs including mind, and those that lie beyond this range. Omniscient God alone knows the latter. Or he whom such God favours can know them. As for the rest, faith pure and simple in the words of God or of some such Prophet is the only means. In the case of such objects reason simply misleads. Reason may go a great way in the case of the objects of the first type, but never in that of the second.

9. Having considered the negative side of the question, let us now turn to the positive side. Here, too, the following paragraphs from Dr. Annie Besant's. Autobiography will be of great help :

"Thus was ushered in 1889, the year to me never-to-be forgotten, in which I found my way 'Home,' and had the priceless good fortune of meeting, and of becoming the pupil of, H. P. Blavatsky :

"...Into the darkness shot a ray of light - A.P. Sinnett's 'Occult World,' with its wonderfully suggestive letters,

expounding not the supernatural but a nature under law, wider than I had dared to conceive. I added Spiritualism to my studies, experimenting privately, finding the pheomena indubitable, but the spiritualistic explanation of them incredible. ...

"...I know, by personal experiment, the Soul exists, and that my Soul, not my body, is myself; that it can leave the body at will; that it can, disembodied, reach and learn from living human teachers, and bring back and impress on the physical brain that which it has learned; that this process of transferring consiousness from one range of being, as it were, to another, is a very slow process, during which the body and brain are gradually correlated with the subtler form which is essentially that of the Soul, and that my own experience of it, still so imperfect, so fragmentary, when compared with the experience of the highly trained, is like the first struggles of a child learning to speak compared with the perfect oratory of the practised speaker; that consciousness, so far from being dependent on the brain, is more active when freed from the gross forms of matter than when encased within them : that the great Sages spoken of by H. P. Blavatsky exist; that they wield powers and possess knowledge before which our control of Nature and knowledge of her ways is but as child's play."[4]

10. From the above citation it becomes clear that we need not get dis-heartened if our reason leads us no far. The Revelation is there. Inspired souls do appear on this earthly plane from time to time. They are our best guides. They are there to lead us in the right direction. Their human limitations will in no way come in our way. In spite of their human limitations, they possess limitless powers of lifting us up to the limitless. What is needed on our part is whole-hearted and even blind faith, which is of greater service to us than an open-eyed one working with caution. An analogy will drive the truth home. One person sits in a motor-car. Another runs along with

it minding his every step. Who will profit more? And in this connection I can do nothing better than quote Śri Aurobindo Ghosh, one of the great modern spiritual aspirants, who had direct experience of Ultimate Reality in this very life. He writes :

**'It is not the human defects of the Guru that can stand in the way when there is the psychic opening, confidence, and surrender.** The Guru is the channel or the representation or the manifestation of the Divine, according to the measure of his personality or his attainment; but whatever he is, it is the Divine that one opens to, in opening to him; and if something is determined by the power of the channel, more is determined by the inherent and intrinsic attitude of the receiving consciousness, an element that comes out in the surface mind as simple trust or direct unconditional self-giving, and once that is there, the essential things can be gained even from one who seems to others than the disciple an inferior spiritual source, and the rest will grow up in the sadhak of itself, by the Grace of the Divine, even if the human being in the Guru cannot give it. ... **In my own case, I owe the first decisive turn of my inner life to one who was infinitely inferior to me in intellect, education, capacity, and by no means spiritually perfect or supreme;** but having seen a power behind him and (having) decided to turn there for help I gave myself entirely into his hands and followed with an automatic passivity the guidance. He himself was astonished and said to others that he had never met anyone before who could surrender himself so absolutely and without reserve or question to the guidance of the helper. The result was a series of transmuting experiences of such a radical character that he was unable to follow and had to tell me to give myself up in future to the Guide within with the same completeness of surrender as I had shown to the human channel, **I give this example to show how these things work; it is not in the calculated way the human reason wants to lay down, but by a more mysterious and greater law.'**[5]

11. The above citation will thus amply justify the Upaniṣadic dictum. to be found at the end of the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad, that he alone will be able to grasp thoroughly these spiritual truths, who has absolute faith in God as well as in Guru.[6]

12. Moreover, from these citations, it will be amply clear that the Kaṭhopaniṣad dictum, namely, The Ultimate Reality being highly subtle is beyond the ken of human reason, and, as such, can never be known except through a proper spiritual guide,[7] and the Chāndogyopaniṣad dictum, namely. He who has a spiritual guide alone knows it,[8] are not altogether without justification. To drive the truth of this doctrine home, the Chāndogyopaniṣad further employs the following parable :

A person was taken out completely blind-folded from his native land and was set free still blind - folded in a distant alien land. He ran here and there. But such efforts of his were of no avail in taking him back to his native country. Somehow, by God's grace, a good person who happened to pass by, took pity on him, removed the bandage from his eyes and showed him the direction in which lay his native land. Then alone it was possible for him to get back to his native country.[9]

The case with us is the same. The life of Spirit is our native life. Somehow or other, we have strayed away from it. We do not know in what direction it lies. We grope here and there, but find nothing. If, by God's grace, some Guru takes pity on us and removes our ignorance by pointing out the right direction, then alone there is some possibility of our returning to it and of consequently finding perdurable peace. Thus revelation and not reason is our final resort in matters spiritual.

13. Though revealed scriptures may be different for different religions, yet the fact that they are the starting points is

common to all religions. Our parents are different. Nevertheless we have derived our life from them. Because our parents are different, that does not mean that we are childern and others are not. This equally applies to all religions. Prophets and their teachings are like parents and religious followers are like children. There may be people having no religion worth the name. Missionaries may give them their religion and may make them happy. This is certainly a laudable task. This is as good and philanthropic a task as finding out a husband for an unmarried girl. But to go beyond this is not good. Getting husbands for unmarried girls is one thing. But to ask married girls and even those that have far advanced in married life to leave their husbands because they (i.e. the husbands) are, somehow or other, believed by us to be bad is quite another. Those that have got a real religion and have far advanced in it should never be asked to leave it. When such persons are asked to do so, the true missionary spirit degenerats into blind bigotry. That is why Svāmı Vivekānanda wanted Hindus to be better Hindus, Christians to be better Christians, and Mohammedans to be better Mohammedans.

14. Returning to the point let us remind ourselves that, in matters spiritual, books of revelations are our first and the last resort. That is why Bādarāyaṇa Vyāsa, the author of the Brahmasūtra, in his very famous Śrutestu Śabdamūla Sūtra[10], boldly declares that there is no harm whatsoever in immolating Reason at the alter of Revelation. And Śri-Vallabhācārya, too, in his Bhāṣya on the Janmādi Sūtra[11], with equal boldness states that one is welcome to him if one has absolute faith in Revelation and never otherwise[12];dan further states that because Revelation has declared so, it cannot be otherwise[13].

15. After thus establishing not only the importance but also the indispensibility of Revelation, let us now turn to which

revealed scriptures Śrī–Vallabhācārya relies on. He, in his Tattvadīpa–Nibandha,[14] enumerates them as follows :

The Vedas, the words of the Lord in the Bhagavadgītā, the Aphorisms of Bādarāyaṇa Vyāsa, and the Inspired Portions of the Bhāgavata. As to their mutal relations, he states that the succeeding work amplifies the meaning of the preceding one.[14] Thus, being at the root, the Vedas are the most important.

16. Now let us consider what these Vedas are according to the Orthodox Belief. According to this Belief, the embody the Eternal Truth in Eternal Words. Not only the Truth taught therein is Eternal, but the very Words, the very order of these Words and even of Letters constituting these Words are also Eternal. All these are neither created nor destroyed. They eternally exist in the bosom of God, the Eternal Ultimate Principle. As every morning reveals the Sun, so every dawn of creation reveals them. As the Sun was already there simply hidden from the view of man, so they were already there simply hidden from the view of men. As such, according to the Orthodox Belief, their Authority is Absolute, i.e., by itself and not depending on any other external factor. As such to temper with them is sacrilege.

17. As for the remaining three works, they do embody the Eternal Truth, but the words embodying it are not eternal. Their authors did visualize the Eternal Truth as embodied in the Eternal words, but for conveying it, they employed their own words. In doing so, they amplified the meaning of the Vedas. The Vedas, are absolutely clear and categorical in their statement of the Eternal Truth. But through human weakness, certain persons are unable to grasp it. In their minds doubts arise as to the exact nature of this Eternal Truth. These latter works serve to dispel them. Thus their service is also very great.

18. Incidentally, from the rationalistic point of view, one point requires clarification; and without this clarification, whatever has been stated above becomes almost meaningless. Had there been only one Book of Revelation, e.g., the Vedas, in and for the whole world, no trouble would have, at all or ever, arisen. All would have had the same belief and the matter would have ended there. But, unfortunately for the peace of the world this is not the case. Besides the Vedas, we have other Books of Revelation too, namely, the Bible and the Koran. For the Christians and the Mohammedans, the Bible and the Koran are respectively as authoritative as the Vedas for the Hindus. Moreover, had their contents been the same though their language differed, even then much trouble would not have arisen. For, nowadays we do find these Books of Revelation translated into different languages. But that also is not the case, Now, last but not the least has come the Positive Science dealing a death-blow to a number of orthodox beliefs based on statements to be found in these Books of Revelation. Take for instance the Christian belief about the date of creation of this world. According to the Bible, the world was created some four or five centuries before Christ. The evolutionary science has given a direct lie to this belief. To cite another instance let us go to the Bhāgavata, one of the four authoritative works for the Hindus according to Śrī-Vallabhācārya. According to this Bhāgavata, it is not the earth that goes round the Sun but vice versa, i.e., it is the Sun that goes round the Earth. Now, no sincere student of modern astronomy can accept this, however great an admirer of the Bhāgavata he may be in other respects. Such being the case, how are we to satisfy our rational sense and at the same time stick to our Orthodox Belief? This is really a very serious problem. And in the present age of strictly scientific mental attitude, we cannot afford to evade this issue if we really want the educated public to be sincerely religious. So let us face this problem fairly and squarely.

19. To do so, let us first amplify this issue. The conflict detailed above on close analysis takes two distinct forms : one, that of the various Books of Revelation with Positive Sciences; and the other, that among the various Books of Revelation themselves.

20. Let us consider first that between the various Books of Revelation and Positive Sciences. The spheres of the two are ordinarily distinct. And if they restrict themselves to their respective spheres, no conflict will arise. Body, bodily comforts, and the external universe are the proper sphere of Positive Sciences. If they turn the gaze inward, they introspect and analyse the mind. Beyond that they do not go. Nor do they care to go. They confine themselves to this life on this earth. They generally never worry about the life hereafter; nor do they worry about the life that might have proceded the present one. Thus, in a way, their sphere is limited. Nevertheless, it must be said to their credit that their pursuit of knowledge is sincere and objective, their sacrifice very great, and their consequent achieve-ements really astounding. Individual conduct, individual and universal peace, peace extending beyond the present life to future ones constitutes on the other hand, the proper sphere of the religious Books of Revelation. **The real religion consists not in what one believes but in how one lives**. If the followers of religion strictly confine themselves to this sphere of theirs, there will arise no occasion to come into conflict with Positive Sciences. On the contrary, they will have to learn a lot from the sincere conduct of the pioneers of Positive Sciences. But the trouble starts when the followers of religion cross the boundary of their sphere attack the theories of Positive Sciences; and also when the scientists leave their sphere and begin to give their opinions on matters of which they know nothing, e.g., when they proudly proclaim that there is nothing like soul or the next life. Religion with its promises of peace and happiness in the life after death will not succeed in a conflict with Positive Science which has materially cotributed to the comforts in this very life. The technological advance has

brought about a number of material comforts to a large majority. The advance in medical science has reduced mortality, disease, and even physical pain. Famines there are; but they have lost their virulence. Trainloads of foodstuff are immediately rushed to the famine-stricken areas. Wars there are; but weaker nations receive immense help to fight for preserving their freedom. Sometimes even a forced reconciliation puts a sudden stop to a hotly waged war. There are travelling facilities. There are communication facilities. Dailies, periodicals, and books keep people in constant contact with not only what is happening in the various parts of the world, but also with what progress is being made in various fields from day to day. Cinema and television have enabled men to enjoy various scenes without leaving their towns or houses. This being the case, can an ordinary man have patience enough to wait for the happiness in the life after death leaving that of the present one, especially when there is no guarantee for it? Moreover, the majority of those who preach or teach religion lead a life full of material comforts. How such religious preachers or teachers can induce others to let go material comforts? So it is in the interest of religion to confine itself to its proper sphere of conduct and not to quarrel with science. On the other hand, in what way has Science really profited by neglecting or even destroying Religion? Its evident goal is to make mankind more happy. But has it succeeded in achieving its goal? It is the selfless and spotless character of scientists that has made the present scientific progress possible. But has not Science hopelessly neglected the character of mankind in general? And with what sad result? The potential weapon for its complete annihilation. Better it is for all if Science and Religion join hands, one supplementing the other.

21. Next let us turn to the conflict among the various Religions themselves. The goal of all of them is invariably the peace here and hereafter. They all believe in life after death, i.e. in

the life of Spirit. They are more after mental peace than after material comforts. The saints of all Religions have amply demonstrated in their very lives that this mental peace is a reality to be attained to in this very life. That Prophets appear from time to time to guide people aright is a fact admitted by all Religions. Follow any Prophet sincerely and wholeheartedly and the spiritual peace is yours in this very life. Hinduism respects all Prophets alike. According to it Prophets are God incarnate on this earth. And the real beauty of the Hindu Scriptures lies in the fact that Gautama Buddha who openly condemned them is also declared by them to be an incarnation of God. For he lived the life of peace and taught it to others in the way that suited him and his followers. Moreover, Svāmī Vivekānanda not at all hesitates in declaring Christ too to be an incarnation of God. Although, according to the Hindu Scriptures there is a hierarchy among the various incarnations, yet there is no insistence on some one and on no other. An aspirant is free to worship any Incarnation it likes. Śiva and Śakti are not among the twenty-four famous Incarnations of God. Nevertheless they are widely worshipped among the Hindus. The fundamental belief of the Hindu Scriptures is that the Selfsame Ultimate Principle receives various names. And this belief is as old as the Vedas. "The Substance is One, though the Sages have given different names to it."[15] One highly current stanza of the Hindu Religion states that salutation to any form whatsoever reaches the Ultimate Substance.[16] The Bhagavadgītā also declares in the same strain that worshipper of any other deity is the worshipper also of God the Almighty.[17] The worship of different deities may yield different fruits. But the fact that such a worship does yield a fruit is never doubted. Moreover, Hinduism believes in many lives for the same Spirit. Mistakes of one life may be rectified in another. In this respect Christianity and Islam differ materially from Hinduism. The Bible and the Koran do state that Prophets appear from time to time. But somehow or other the Christians and the Mohammedans respectively came to

believe that Christ and Mohammed were the only Prophets; and that liberation was possible through them alone and through no other. Had the matter stood here and gone no further, no trouble would have arisen at all. But by way of a corollary the Christians believed further that those who did not believe in Christ's divine personality went to hell even through they believed in someone else's divine personality. Not only this. They went a little further and believed that anyone who did not make a public profession that he believed in Christ's personality or who professed to believe in someone else's divinity was a menace to the spiritual welfare of the community and as such deserved either to be exiled or executed. As for the Mohammedans, they came to believe that since Mohammed had taught that God is formless anyone who worshipped God in any form was an infidel and such deserved to be put to sword. Both of them could do as they liked as long as they were backed by temporal power. But what are they now ? Their past deeds have simply served to alienate the minds of men from religion with the inevitable result that the many good points of religion are missed by them. Now there is little respect for an individual. The gross material gain has become the sole guiding motive. Individuals as well as nations give promises as long as such promises further their self-interest. As soon as these promises have done that, they are openly violated. In religion the ideal of God is always before a person. This always reminds a person of his shortcoming. This in turn leads of self-improvement of individuals first, and through them that of the society next. Before materialism there is no such ideal. Moreover there is an implicit belief that the fault lies with external conditions. And certain scientific researches have served to strengthen this belief. Destroy germs and you will be free from diseases. Supply vitamins and deficiency-diseases will disappear. This belief does not stop here. It penetrates the sphere of social conditions. Masses are unhappy not because there is something wrong with them. But this is so simply because of a few vested interests. Destory them and the masses will become

automatically happy. The worst outcome of this belief is that what one thinks is assumed to be right and anything contrary to it is assumed to be wrong. This leads to the belief that you are always right and your opponents are always wrong; and that as long as your opponents live, there is no hope of peace. So, if they are physically weak, they have to be destroyed openly; if they happen to be physically strong, they have to be destroyed secretly. But opponents should not be allowed to remain alive. Every sort of opposition has to be crushed outright. And there is an idle dream born of mental inertia that if this sort of crushing opposition is carried on for some time, opposition will be completely destroyed and there will be harmony everywhere. Religionists should remember that though religions are destroyed, the spirit of persecution is not destroyed. So, they must learn to tolerate other religions. There is some hope of universal peace then alone. The best way is to concentrate on religious behaviour rather than on religious belief. Beliefs are bound to be different as are our bodies. Do we not tolerate others' bodies? Why not then others' beliefs?

22. As has been suggested above, not only different Religions among themselves, but Sciences also should stick to their proper sphere; and should not only tolerate one another but cooperate also with one another. Can we not put different flowers in a bouquet and enhance its beauty? To drive home the utility of Religion, let us further consider it together with Science, its modern great rival. As has been said above, the respective spheres of Religion and Science are quite distinct. But that cannot mean that they should be at daggers drawn. Two men can fight and kill each other if they want to do so. But does this mean that because they can do so, they also should do so? Can they not help each other and live peacefully together? Time makes worst enemies friends. Can they not do voluntarily what they are willing to do under compulsion? Let it be asserted point-blank that such considerations are a

contribution of Religion and not of Science. Neglect of Religion has resulted in the fact that the most wonderful resources of Science are today in the hands of human beings who can only be described as biped beasts. As long as Science, without heeding Religion, will go on studying and exploring the external universe, it will not be able to teach or convince men that they are brothers, and as such they ought to love and help one another. The external nature is red in tooth and claw; and its study by itself will teach men only to become red in tooth and claw. It is Religion which teaches us that we are the sparks of the Self-same Fire. If a mosquito sits on the leg of a person, his hand instinctively hurries there to drive it away. Why? Because they belong to the same person. The same analogy will work in the case of human beings too, provided they have assimilated the truth that they belong to the self-same Entity, that they are different sparks of the Self-same Fire. That is why such mighty divine personalities as Buddha and Christ taught us to love even our enemies. Their teaching proceeded from within and not from without. It is Religion that teaches us to protect the weak instead of exploiting their weakness and getting fatter at their expense. It is Religion which has universal peace and prosperity for its goal. Do we find anything of the sort in the teachings of material Science? Science is neutral. It is after all a means. It can be utilized either for a good or a bad end. But whether an end is good or bad will be taught by Religion.

23. It has been repeatedly stated above that the spherse Religion and Science are distinct. So it is wrong to judge one from the standards of the other. Take an ordinary instance from our common experience. In our everyday commerce, i.e. in our day-to day transactions we give and we take. The laws of giving are different from those of taking. When we purchase a thing, we follow the laws of taking. Before purchasing we first examine it. We also look to the person who

sells it. If the thing is found to be defective, we refuse to purchase it. If it turns out that the person concerned happens to be a thief, we refuse to have any more dealings with him. Moreover, when both the thing and the person concerned are found satisfactory, we try to bring down the price. When the price is settled, we only pay that much and no more. These are laws generally applicable to all acts of purchasing. Suppose, for instance, that we have to purchase a thing out of strict necessity. Then the above laws become wholly in applicable. We have an adage "Necessity knows no law." When a strict necessity arises, we do not look much to the quality of a thing. For instance when we purchase food-stuff at a fair-price or a ration-shop, we receive willingly or unwillingly whatever is supplied to us without looking to the quality or otherwise thereof. Moreover, when a thing is urgently needed, we do not even higgle-haggle for the price of that thing. Now, let us turn to the other act, namely, that of giving. There we try to pass on even a defective thing. Then we do not look to the character of a person purchasing it. If he is a fool prepared to pay the price demanded by us without looking to the thing purchased. so far so good. We want just such a customer. If from the act of selling we turn to that of feeding liberally, new laws emerge. We serve the best dishes. We do not look to the character of the persons fed. Let us now, in order to make the point still more clear, consider business-relations and love-relations. In business-relations we always look to the persons and to their respective merits. We pay more to persons who are more serviceable. "Get on or get out." is the maxim of business-relations. But the case with love-relations is just the opposite. Suppose, a mother has two sons. One earns a lot, the other is a young child. Will the mother pay greater attention to the earning son, and less to the younger one? From these instances it will be amply clear that laws applicable to one set of relations are not applicable to another such set. Thus to apply the standards

of Science to Religion and then discredit it is absolutely wrong.

24. After this general consideration of the difference of standards in different spheres, let us now come to the close consideration of those in the spheres of Science and Religion. "No trusting without testing" is a very healthy maxim of not only Science but of general commerce too. But if we strictly stick to this maxim, our progress though definite will be very slow and sometimes impossible. In a number of cases, trust and unconditional surrender become indispensable conditions. When we sow a seed, we do not make a stipulation with the soil. We surrender it to the soil unconditionally. If in ninety-nine cases the seed sprouts. in one case it rots too. Similarly. when we invest a sum in a business enterprise. we do not make a stipulation with the enterprise. We invest our sum unconditionally. In ninety-nine cases we make a profit, but in one case we may lose also. And even in the field of scientific research, we never stipulate with our experiment first and then proceed with it. Here out of ten, only one succeeds and nine fail. When we are serious, our attitude at once changes. All idle talk ceases, and we willingly take a risk, Here trust comes first. It is the very starting point. Science starts with doubt, Religion starts with faith. Now what this faith is can be seen from the following lines from the pen of no less a personality than Mahātmā Gāndhi himself :

"It is faith that steers us through stormy seas, faith that moves mountains, and faith that jumps across the ocean. That faith is nothing but a living, wide-awake consciousness of God within. He who has achieved that faith wants nothing. Bodily diseased he is spiritually healthy; physically poor, he rolls in spiritual riches.

"Without faith this world would come to naught in a moment. True faith is appropriation of the reasoned experience of people whom we belive to have lived a life purified by prayer

and penance. Belief, therefore, in prophets or incarnations who have lived in remote ages is not an idle superstition but a satisfaction of an inmost spiritual want.

"Faith is not a delicate flower which would wither under the slightest stormy weather. Faith is like the Himalaya mountains which cannot possibly change. No storm can possibly remove the Himalaya mountains from their foundation ...And I want every one of you to cultivate that faith in God and religion."[18]

Śrī-Vallabhācārya, too, lays full stress on this Faith in God. He advises us not to lose this Faith even for a moment. He says : Where everything fails, Faith succeeds. The doors of this Faith are closed to none; they are open to all and at all times.[19] This Faith, however, is not something to be toyed with. Flouting God in periods of prosperity and then praying to him in hours of adversity and then forgetting him completely and thereafter returning to the old ways will generally never succeed. The scientific spirit of doubt works in the sphere of Religion too. Here the Faith itself is tested. Love of humanity or of all creation is the fundamental constituent of Real Religion. The Ultimate Principle governing the Universe, it is immaterial whether you call it God or Nature, tested Christ. And Christ passed the test. And this is the invariable experience of all the lovers of God and the world, the great saints of all Religions who have shed and have continued to shed the light in order to dispel darkness which, somehow or other, envelops this world of mortals. According to Hinduism Faith in an idol is just its beginning. It gradually goes on increasing till it embraces the whole universe, which is its point of culmination. This may take a number of lives. But fortunately at times such persons do incarnate on this earth in whose life this culmination point is seen to have been reached in this very life as a result of strenuous efforts in past lives. According to Hinduism, Buddha

was such a person. Reaching this point of culmination, such persons cease to be human and become divine. They are no more men. They are God incarnate, God in flesh and blood walking upon this earth and talking to us mortals.

25. To resume the thread let us return to the Orthodox Belief that the Vedas are Eternal Words embodying Eternal Truth. Unfortunately, all the truths embodied in these Scriptures are not borne out by later historical as well as scientific research. At times they are given a direet lie. How are we to stick to the Orthodox Belief in such circumstances ? Moreover; what justification can we find for such personalities as Śrī-Vallabhācārya, whom we are tempted to regard as almost omniscient, holding such Orthodox Belief as finds little justfication in the light of latest research? And it is this point which we shall now consider. In the immediately preceding paragraph it has been stated that, according to Hinduism, Religion starts with a faith in an idol. An idol is believed to be God. Objectively such an idol is either a well-shaped, or ill-shaped or even shapeless piece of metal or stone. But, subjectively it is God. And it is this subjective belief that is at the root of all religious progress. Let it be a piece of metal or stone for others and even for our physical eyes and even our physical mind. But in our heart of hearts it is God incarnate, it is God who is manifest for us in this form, limitless God, manifest in a form having limitations, in spite of these limitations. With open-eyed-nevertheless blind faith an aspirant proceeds further. The God of Belief gradually becomes the God of actual experience. And this is not a piece of idle imagination. We had amidst us just a century ago a historical personality having such experience in the person of Svāmī Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahaṁsa. It is on this line only that we can justify the Orthodox Belief held by such personalities as Śrī-Vallabhācārya. Whatever these Scriptures are objectively, subjectively they are Eternal Words embodying Eternal Truth. And, just as an idol, which to others remains an idol

but to a sincerely devout worshipper becomes God walking before and talking to him, in the same way Eternal Truth manifests itself to such a sincere believer. This belief is part and parcel of spiritual discipline. In military discipline also we have :

"There's not to reason why;
There's but to do and die,"[20]

In this connection I am tempted to quote again the remarks of Mahātmā Aurobindo Ghosh who had had the direct vision of the Ultimate Reality in this very life. He writes :

"It is not the human defects of the Guru that can stand in the way when thers is the psychic opening, confidence and surrender. ...In my own case, I owe the first decisive turn of my inner life to one who was infinitely inferior to me in intellect, education, capacity, and by no means spiritually perfect or supreme; but having seen a power behind him and (having) decided to turn there for help I gave myself entirely into his hands and followed with an automatic passivity the guidance. ...I give this example to show how these things work; it is not in the calculated way the human reason wants to lay down, but by a more mysterious and greater law."[21] In all humility I say that this is my only way of justifying Śrī-Vallabhācāya's belief and bold remark that there is not a single letter in the whole of the Veda that is not true.[22]

26. Apart from all that has been stated above, it must be admitted, from the objective point of view, that there are many Scriptural statements and beliefs which are contrary to the facts established unmistakeably by Science. To resolve this conflict a way has been suggested, which is not altogether unreasonable. Scriptures have recorded beliefs current at the time when they came to be composed. All these beliefs, especially those connected with the objective universe, were based on the imperfsct knowledge of the persons of the age. To such

beliefs we need not attach any great importance. Moreover some statements might have been poetic exaggeration They too need not be attached any great importance. Certain portions may be apocryphal. It is certainly very difficult to separate the genuine portions from the dross. But that does not mean that because of some dross, the genuine portions too should be thrown away. Suppose, a limb of a certain person is diseased. That does not mean, however, that that person should be killed outright, As long as he is alive, he is allowed to remain so. Something of the sort has to be done with regard to Scriptures. The Orthodox Believers, including Śrī-Vallabhācārya, are conscious of this fact. And with regard to Bhāgavata. he has even stated in unmistakeable terms that its inspired portions (Samādhi-Bhāṣā) alone are fully authoritative. As for the remaining ones he states that they are authoritative in so far as they conform to the inspired ones.[23] But, ultimately, his attitude is more that of a mystic than of a critic. Moreover, the real beauty of Śrī Vallabhācārya lies in the fact that he is never a fanatic.

27. As stated above Srī-Vallabhācārya is never a fanatic, He is very liberal-minded. In his Tattvydīpa-Nibandha he enjoins his followers to respect anywhere and everywhere what conforms to the Vedic Teaching.[24] Physically a strict adherent of the caste-system and a sincere observer of all rules pertaining thereto, he was nevertheless mentally very liberal. He respected more those who were on a higher spiritual plane. And in that case he did not look to their lower social status. That is why some of the devotees of his and of his son's come from very low castes and communities. He is, however, not in favour of making a mess of everything on this account. He fully respects all social institutions, especially when these latter have scriptual sanction. But, at the same time he believes and boldly teaches that social shortcomings are no barriers to spiritual progress and even to spiritual success.[25]

28. After so much digression necssitated by the sceptical attitude of modern readers, we may now safely turn to what type of attitude Śrī-Vallabhācārya has towards his Scriptural Authorities.

29. In his Aṇubhāṣya,[26] he himself has described four such attitudes : (i) To attach greatest importance to the direct import of the words neither adding to nor subtracting from the meaning thus obtained. (ii) To attach equal importance to the words as well as to their meaning. (iii) To attach greater importance to the meaning rather than to the words. (iv) To attach greatest importance to the meaning and not to the words. How these four different attitudes arise will be clear from the following consideration. As stated above, according to the Orthodox Belief, the Vedas are the Eternal Words embodying the Eternal Truth. And as such, not every word but even every letter thereof is authoritative for a strictly Orthodox Person. So the only attitude consistent with this belief is to show equal respect to all the passages. But such a consistency lands us into a trouble. For, there are certain passages of the Vedas the meaning whereof conflicts with that of certain other passages. Take for instance the following two passages : (i) One, meaning that the Ultimate Reality cannot be seen with the eyes.[27] and (ii) the other, meaning that some wise person did see this Ultimate Reality with his eyes.[28] No man in his senses can accept both these. How is it possible to see a thing that cannot be seen at all ? Even an ordinary fellow knows it fully well. That a thing can be seen and cannot be seen at the same time is logically impossible. If you want to show equal respect to both the adove passages, then you will have to let go your logic. And if you want to stick to your logic, you will have to let go your respect for one of the above two Vedic passages. And the trouble is not to end even there. You will have to justify yourself why you respect one passage and reject the other. And for that too you will be relying on your logic. So logic and human

reason become supreme. Thus if logic and human reason can decide the nature of the Ultimate Reality, what is the use of these Scriptures at all? Why leave the liberty of logic, a sure science, and make yourself dependent on the words of others? But the trouble is that our logic does not carry us far; and that is just the reason why we go to the Vedas leaving logic behind. (This has been amply shown in the beginning of this Chapter.) You will have then to make a choice between two clear-cut courses : Logic or the Vedic Word. If logic, let go the Vedic word. If the Vedic word, let go your logic. Śrī-Vallabhācārya is for the Vedic word and not for logic, which is a product of the human mind having a lot of limitations. His is the first attitude and cares little consistency. Others cannot reject logic altogether. They literally accept one of the two passages that suits their temperament and then in order to remain consistent with the meaning of that passage they try to explain the meaning of the other passage metaphorically. Śrī-Vallabhācārya cannot tolerate such liberty with the Vedic Word, The Supreme Authority. But more of this will be discussed in the next chapter in its proper place. But before doing so, I am tempted once more to quote the following words Śrī-Aurobindo Ghosh : **"I give this example to show how these things work; it is not the calculated way the human reason wants to lay down, but by a more mysterious and greater law."**[29] Do these words not amply justify Śrī-Vallabhācārya's attitude towards the Scriptures?

---

## CHAPTER III

## ULTIMATE REALITY

1. In the System of Śuddhādvaita Vedānta, otherwise known as Brahmavāda, the One, Secondless Ultimate Reality is the only category. Every other thing has proceeded from it at the time of creation, is non-different from it during creation, and merges into it at the time of dissolution. The two other well-known categories, namely, the animate souls and the inanimate objects are respectively its parts and modifications. The animate souls are its parts because they retain to some extent the essential qualities thereof, namely, consciousness and joy. The inanimate objects are its modifications, because the above said qualities are absent therein. The nearest analogy is that of a gold ingot. Small particles of gold can be had therefrom. Ornaments too can be made thereof. The Ultimate Reality corresponds to the gold ingot; the animate souls to small particles; and the inanimate objects exhibiting rich variety to various ornaments. Particles and ornaments are in substance no less gold.

2. 'God' is nothing but a convenient theological term for this Ultimate Reality. In the Vedic Scriptures it is called 'Brahma' because it is greater than its parts, the animate souls and its modifications, the inanimate objects. It is also called 'Paramātmā' because it pervades them all. These two aspects are more or less impersonal. In its personal aspect it is known as 'Bhagavān', the word which is generally an equivalent of 'God'. These different words will be employed in different contexts. But their meaning will be one and the same, namely, the Ultimate Reality.

3. For his metaphysical system which centres round this One, Secondless Ultimate Reality, Śrī-Vallabhācārya has wholly

relied on the Vedic Scriptures, especially, the Upaniṣads, which are generally known as 'Śruti'. And in what follows the words 'Vedic passage', 'Upaniṣadic Passage', 'Śruti-Passage' and 'Scriptural Passage', are employed in the same sense.

4. 'Śuddhādvaita' means unity pure and simple. Now let us first see how Śrī-Vallabhācārya, wholly relying on Vedic Scriptures, arrives at such a doctrine and next consider whether there is some rational justification for the same.

5. Turning to the Upaniṣads, which form a very vital part of Vedic Scriptures so far as their metaphysical doctrine is considered, we find the Passage,

"Sad eva Somya idam agree āsīd, ekam eva advitīyam"[1] meaning "In the beginning there was only one Real Entity, only one and that too without a second". Thereafter comes another Passage.'

"Tad aikṣata 'Bahu syām, prajāyeya' iti"[2] meaning "That one Real Entity wished : Let me become many, let me multiply myself". And later on it is stated that it did become many and did multiply itself. Relying on these two and similar other passages, Śrī-Vallabhācārya has arrived at his doctrine of Śuddhādvaita Brahmavāda. Now let us see what this "Sat", the Ultimate Reality, is Some Western Philospher has remarked to the effect that man first looks out, next looks in, and then looks up.[3] And it is in this way that we become aware of the world without, of the soul within, and of God beyond. Physical sciences study the world without; psychical sciences study the soul within; and theological systems study God beyond. The discussion in detail of the natures of the world without and of the soul within has little relevance in this thesis. So, it is only in their relation with the Ultimate Reality that their natures will be discussed later on. So for the present let us confine ourselves to the discussion of the nature of God, the Ultimate Substance, from which, according to the Vedāntic

doctrine, both the world without and the soul within are derived.

6. From the strictly rationalistic point of view, the enlightened human mind is the only source from which all concepts arise. So, it is to this source that we have to turn for our concept of God. Mahātmā Gāndhi, as all know, was certainly endowed with an enlightend mind. Now, let us see what he has to say about God. He writes.

"There is an indefinable mysterious power that pervades everything. **I feel it though I do not see it.** It is this unseen power which makes itself felt and yet defies all proof because is so unlike all that I perceive through my senses. It transcends the senses.

"But it is possible to reason out the existence of God to a limited extent. Even as an ordinary affair we know that people do not know who rules or why and how he rules. And yet they know that there is a power that certainly rules... I do feel ... that there is orderliness in the universe, there is an unalterable law governing everything and every being that exists or lives. **It is not a blind law; for no blind law can govern the conduct of living beings. That law then which governs all life is God.** Law and lawgiver are one. I may not deny that Law and Lawgiver, because I know so little about it or him. Even as my denial or ignorance of the existence of an earthly power will avail me nothing, so will not my denial of God and his Law liberate me from its operation; whereas humble and mute acceptance of divine authority makes life's journey easier as the acceptance of earthly rule makes life under it easier.

"I do dimly perceive that as everything around me is ever changing, ever dying, there is underlying all that change a living power that is changeless, that holds all together, that creates, dissolves, and recreates. The informing power or spirit is God. ...

"And is this power benevolent or malevolent? I see it purely benevolent. For I can see that in the midst of death life persists, in the midst of untruth truth persists, in the midst of darkness light persists. Hence I gather that God is Life, Truth, Light. He is Love. He is supreme Good...I confess that I have no argument to convince through reason. Faith transcends reason."[4]

From these gems from the pen of Mahātmā Gāndhī, a veritable prophet of the present age, it will appear that God is more of a powerful principle to be felt in one's own life rather than to be known through senses or to be demonstrated to others dialectically or experimentally. It is just like one's health. It is something to be felt and not known through eyes or ears. Ordinarily, what is vital is generally felt, and what is non-vital is generally known. A doctor only knows the pain, but the patient actually feels it. Moreover, this God is a powerful principle that controls the universe, a powerful principle that keeps everything in order, a powerful principle that silently and incessantly works regardless of the fact whether we are conscious or unconscious of its existence. In other words, God is like the law of gravitation that goes on working incessantly though silently regardless of the fact whether people know it or not. Moreover, God resembles force. We do not know what force is. We know, however, what force does. In this respect God and our own soul are alike. We do not know what a human or an animal soul is. But we certainly know what it does. The body that is animated, functions. The one which is dead, does not. Physically and chemically a living body and a dead body do not much differ. Then this functioning of the body is due to the presence of the soul in it. This soul may have individuality and consciousness as is the case with either the human or the animal soul. Or it may have no individuality and no consciousness as is the case with the state of perfect fitting of the various parts of a machine. Nevertheless, this state of perfect fitting of the various parts of a machine is the soul of that machine. If it is there, the

machine works; if not, it does not. If we want to know the omnipresent nature of God, it will be absolutely necessary for us to extend our notion of the soul. In today's thought, our notion of the soul is very limited. It is limited only to the principle animating a human or an animal body. In Indian philosophical thought, the word 'Ātmā' has this extended sense. It is derived as

"Atati vyāpnoti iti Ātmā".

meaning 'Ātmā is that which pervades and thus anumates'. Returning to the point, let us note that Mahātma Gāndhi has, moreover, found this God to be good.

7. But here a very pertinent question can arise in our mind. Is this principle intelligent ? i.e., Does it work with discrimination ? Or, does it work blindly and inexorably like the law of gravitation ? An answer to this will be found in the following words of Dr. Rādhākrishnan, another enlightened Indian mind :

"Philosophy has its roots in man's practical needs. If a system of thought cannot justify fundamental human instincts and interpret the deeper spirit of religion, it cannot meet with general acceptance. The speculations of philosophers, which do not comfort us in our stress and suffering, are more intellectual diversion and not serious thinking. The absolute of Śaṁkara, rigid, motionless, and totally lacking in initiative or influence, cannot call forth our worship.... **The obvious fact of experience that, when weak and erring human beings call from the depths, the helping hand of grace is stretched out from the unknown, is ignored. Śaṁkara does not deal justly with the living sense of companionship which the devotees have in their different lives.**"[5]

Before commenting upon these lines, I am tempted to quote the following lines from Sūradāsa :

"Suneri maine nirbalake bala Rāma
Pichalı sākha bharūṃ santanakı,
Āḍe saṃbhāre kāma."[6]

meaning that the poet has heard that **God helps the helpless**; and that he can cite a number of instances from the lives of devotees that God had always stood by their side in the hour of their need and has as a rule ferried them across, out of troubles, safely to the other shore.

Coming to the point, from the above words of Dr. Rādhākrishnan, we learn that this governing principle, conveniently termed God, is not only powerful, but is also kind. He is ever ready to help a person in distress. Call him forth frem the depth of your heart; and he is there eagerly wating to come to your help. Moreover, he is always by your side. He never leaves you even for a moment. It is something like the clearness of water. It is always there. Remove the dirt and it is there. You have not to import it from outside.

8. Not only saints like Mahātmā Gāndhī, but scientists like Sri C. V. Rāman have also amply experienced this kind and constant companionship of this Ultimate Principle. This latter when visiting Ahmedabad had said in one of his lectures that during various scientific experiments he was just like a person groping in darkness; nevertheless it was his constant experience that he hit upon the right course either in his first, second, or third attempt. And it is because of the complete conviction of the kind and constant companionship of the good God guiding our intellect that the Vedic Seer, Viśvāmitra, in his famous Gāyatrī Mantra, which is daily repeated by devout Brahmins, prays to the Ultimate Principle that it may lead him aright; and Śrī-Vallabhācārya prays as follows :

"Buddhi-preraka-Kṛṣṇasya pāda-padmam prasīdatu"[8]
meaning "May the lotus-foot of Lord Kṛṣṇa, who guides our intellect, do us favour".

Coming to the point, we are compelled to state that to ignore the solid experiences of such devotes of Truth as Mahātmā Gandhī and Sri C. V. Rāman and to say that God

is merely an idea arising in a weak mind suffering from fear-complex is mere meaningless persistence in one's own ignorance, more to be pitied than condemned.

9. Now let us see if any other consideration leads us in this direction. The Bible says : Kingdom of God is amongst you."[9] The Kaṭha Upaniṣad in the same strain says :

> "Kaścid dhīraḥ pratyag-ātmānam aikṣad
> Āvṛtta-cakṣur amṛtatvam icchan.[10]

meaning "Some rare seeker of like eternal turned his gaze inward and saw God face to face." God is both within and without. The difference is, however, that God without is simply known whereas God within is actually felt. The hunger of another person is simply known; but one's own hunger is keenly felt. And knowing and feeling are Worlds apart. Other thinkers simply knew that the world is full of misery, whereas Gautuma Buddha actually felt it. Other Indians knew that India was in bondage, whereas Mahātmā Gāndhī actually felt it. In the same way, philosophers simply know that God is everywhere, whereas saints actually feel his presence everywhere. That is why the hearts of the latter are fully of compassion for even the tiniest of creatures.

10. Moreover, even where God without is known, it is so always with the help of the mental apparatus that lies within. So let us direct our gaze inward. Doing so, we find that our enlightened mind is full of certain notions. And one very important notion among these is that of infinity. Almost all the objects of our experience are finite, i.e., limited in time, space, and substance. And the finite nature of these objects leaves us dissatisfied. We hanker after more and more. Take for instance, our knowledge. This knowledge is a very vital part of our nature. It is this knowledge, this ever-expanding knowledge that has made man the master of things. The progress

of civilization is no less due to this ever-expanding knowledge. The amount of knowledge that has gradually accumulated during the recent decades is simply tremendous. Nevertheless it is limited, and it has left humanity dissatisfied, which as such hankers after more and more of it. Now, a very pertinent and a searching question can be asked : how are we to explain this notion of infinity and the consequent sense of dissatisfaction? Moreover, there is a definite progress; and besides this there is also now an undisputed fact of evolution. But we can ask here also : Granted that there is a progress or an evolution; but in what direction? Certainly not in the direction of that which is not. Such a belief is simply shocking. As much shocking as the belief that something comes out of nothing. As for this latter belief, it is referred to and refuted by a direct appeal to the heart even in the Upaniṣads.

> "Tad ha eke āhuḥ :
> Asad eva idam agre āsıt. ...Tasmād asatāḥ
> sad jāyata. Kutaḥ tu khalu Somya evam syāt. ...
> Katham asatḥ sad jāyeta."[11]

It is here said : "Some say that what we perceive today was absolutely nonexistent in the past. But, my dear, how can it be possible? How can something come out of nothing?" We neither believe in absolute past nor in absolute future, as the continuous cycle of Satyuga, Tretayuga, Dwaparyuga and Kaliyuga. They believed that such a golden age did exist in the past; and we believe that our future golden age is not merely a wishful thinking. The historical current of the past as well as the present centuries definitely points in that direction. We may or may not believe in a Personal God ruling over the univese like a king either despotic, just, or benevolent. But no sane man can deny this ideal state of bliss which either was in the past or will be in the future. And if we equate this ideal state with God, there remains no difficulty whatsoever in believing in the existence of God. Mahātmā Gandhı, a staunch believer in God, could convince others only when he made Truth his

God. Theists or no-theists, saints or scientists - all without an exception are votaries of Truth. And there is no harm whatsoever in inverting our position. Instead of making questionable God our ideal, let us make our definite ideal our God. The word 'Paramātmā' for God in Indian Theology has this inversion at its root. God is an ideal state of Ātmā, the soul.

11. Though the method adopted by Indian Philosophers and Religionists appear to be dogmatic, their great authority, the Vedas, especially the Upaniṣadic portions, appear not to have adopted the same. The questioning spirit which permeates them is simply admirable. Take for instance, the opening portion of the Svetāśvataropaniṣad :

> "Aum ! Brahmavādino vadanti :
> Kim kāraṇam Brahma? Kuṭaḥ sma jātāḥ?
> Jīvāma kena? Kva ca sampratiṣṭhāḥ?
> Adhiṣṭhitāḥ kena sukhetareṣu
> Vartāmahe Brahmavido vyavasthām?"[12]

meaning "Philosophers ask such questions as : What is the Ultimate Cause? Who is responsible for our creation? What sustains us? What supports us? What drives us in the direction which we are least willing to take?" Is there anything dogmatic about this? To take another instance let us turn to the Śvetaketūpākhyāna of the Chāndogyopaniṣad. Here Śvetaketu returns conceited from his preceptor after completing his studies. His father in order to humble his pride asks him :

> "Śvetaketo, yan nu, Somya, idam mahāmanā anūcānamānī stabdhaḥ asi, uta tam ādeśam aprākṣyaḥ yena aśrutam śrutam bhavati, amatam matam, avijñātam vijñātam iti"[13]

meaning "My dear Svetaketu, you think yourself great, you think you have studied everything, you feel proud; but have you

learnt from your preceptor, that which enables you to know even that which you have not learnt, to know that which you have otherwise not known, and to visualize that which you do not face?" There is nothing absurd about such a sweeping question. Look to money in our ordinary commerce. Does it not enable us to procure so many things though by itself it is one. Take another instance. Does a microscope though one not enable us to see so many minute things not otherwise seen? Is this attitude dogmatic? As to the fundamentals even the scientists and logicians have to believe in them, Even a doubter cannot doubt everything. He has to believe in himself and in his doubting method.

12. The last-quoted instance is relevant to the point under consideration. We go on adding and adding to our knowledge, and still we want to know more and more. Will this hunger ever be satisfied ? The Upaniśads say 'yes' They say :

> "Bhidyate hṛdaya-granthiḥ,
> Chidyante sarva-saṁśayāḥ;
> Kṣīyante cāsya karmāṇi
> Tasmin dṛṣṭe parāvare."[14]

meaning "The knot tying the mind snaps asunder, all the doubts are set at rest, there remains nothing to be done when once the Highest Reality is caught hold of." The true grasp of the Highest principle brings about complete, satiation. The Bhagavadgītā also says :

> "Yam labdhvā cāparam lābham
> Manyate nādhikam tataḥ;
> Yasmin sthito na duḥkhena
> Guruṇāpi vicālyate."[15]

meaning "Once you have had this greatest gain, you feel that nothing more is required. Nay more ! Let all calamities be set you – all at the same time. But you remain perfectly unruffied."

13. After referring to knowledge in its infinite aspect, let us now turn to power. Although it is being popularly said that 'Knowledge is power,' yet they are essentially different, and this general statement is merely metaphorical. And the difference between them can clearly be grasped from the popular parable of the blind and the lame persons. The lame person had only the knowledge of the road, whereas the blind person had only the power to move on the road. Coming to the point practically all of us do possess some power, however limited in extent it may be. But, as in the case of the knowledge so in the case of this power too, we want to have more and more of it.

14. Now let us combine these two vital aspects of humanity, knowledge and power, and also combine them with the notion of infinity which alone can explain our hankering after more and more of them; and still further combine them with the already discussed principle of "Something can never come out of nothing," an entity having infinite knowledge and infinite power can very easily be postulated though not proved. And we can conveniently term such an entity 'God' And this very well conforms with the general notion of God as omniscient and omnipotent, i.e. all-knowing and all-powerful. And let us not forget that in an intelligent being these two factors will always remain together. For we know from our own experience that most of our powerlessness arises from our ignorance. We may have power but for want of knowledge it becomes of no use. And it is just this that has given rise to the adage "knowledge is power." Moreover, the present human mastery over physical forces is due solely to the vast amount of knowledge acquired during recent decades.

15. Now, besides these two, namely, knowledge and power, there is a third very important element in life; and this is goodness. Kindness and loveliness are mere variations of goodness. So they need not be considered separately. By themselves knowledge and power are neutral. They can be used for good

as well as bad ends. The gods possess knowledge and power to a considerable extent. Demons also do the same. But, whereas the former use them for good ends, the latter do so for bad ones. This is the only difference between gods and demons. As for this goodness, we do have it in life, but to a limited extent. To remain healthy is good; but we are not ideally healthy. To be wealthy is good, but we do not have wealth to the extent we would like to have it. We can combine the notion of goodness with that of infinity. And we have the notion of infinite goodness, not finding which we remain ever dissatisfied. Now, this infinite goodness also is closely related to infinite knowledge and infinite power. For, ignorance and weakness are generally not good.

16. Now, the close association of these three infinite elements will necessarily bring a fourth element, namely, that of omnipresence, i.e. presence at all places and at all times. To understand the necessity of this omnipresence, let us take a concrete example. A has a son B, who has gone to England for study. After studying for a few years, this latter is due for a very important examination. In what way can his father A who lives in India be of actual help to him in his examination ? If this A has living faith in an omniscient, omnipotent, and omnigood God, he can at best pray to this latter. But if this latter, i.e., God to whom A has prayed to help his son B in the examination in England is not present there at the time of the examination, how can he help B ? So without being omnipresent, God who is omniscient, omnipotent, and omnigood will be able to do nothing; and so without omnipresence these three previous qualities will cease to be what they are. So, if there is God, he must be omniscient, omnipoent, omnigood, and omnipresent. With our limited intellectual faculties it is impossible to visualize. i.e. to comprehend such Almighty God. And hence the necessity of Faith.

17. Science, which proceeds with doubt, which is proud of its own achievement, which wants to give shape to things unknown in the light of the limited knowledge it possesses, and which roughly brushes aside as imaginary whatever it cannot satisfactorily explain, and which nevertheless does not admit its own inability, can never lead us far. It is the Faith, the instinctive faith of a highly noble, a highly humble, and a highly imaginative mind, that alone will enable man to grasp the farthest and the deepest mysteries of the universe. "No trusting without testing" is a very valuable maxim; but to deny the existence of a thing altogether simply because one has no knowledge thereof is disasterous to the progress of science. Sir J. C. Bose successfully demonstrated that life permeates even so-called lifeless substances. But this idea he had inherited from the sages of the past who had arrived at it instinctively, It is the haughtiness of physlcal sciences. which are dazzled with the excessive light of their positive material achievements, that has arrested their progress from proceeding to and exploring innumerable other spheres. In this connection the following verse is very instructive :

> "It is not wisdom to be only wise,
> And on the inward vision close the eyes.
> But it is wisdom to believe the heart :
> Columbus found the world and had no chart."[16]

And even in the sphere of physical sciences, the greatest inventions had their roots in human imagination. Television, the greatest of modern invention, took its shape first in the imagination of its inventor, Dr. Baird. In denying spirit and its infinite potential capacities, physical sciences are suffering from the vice of "little learning" spoken of in the following lines :

> "Little learning is a dangerous thing;
> Drink deep or taste not pierian spring :
> There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
> And drinking largely sobers us again."[17]

After this much consideration, it will be amply clear that the belief in some Ideal Ultimate Principle, conveniently called God, is not altogether without rational foundation.

18. Now, we may safely turn to the Vedas and to the philosophic system of Śrī-Vallabhācārya, which is founded on them, for what they have to say in connection with so rich an entity as God.

19. The Vedas declare :

> "Sad eva Somya idam agre āsīd, ekam eva advitīyam."[18]

which means : "There was, in the beginning, only one real substance, and that too, without a second." Later on it is stated that the universe with all its rich variety proceeded from it and after some time (it is immaterial how vast it is) this universe will return to it and will become one with it. The language employed here is metaphysical. Paraphrased into the theological one, it comes to this : God, one and without a second, created this universe out of himself and will after some time take it back into himself. But here our chief concern is with one point only namely : God is one and that too without a second. And it is this point which is going to be taken up for detailed consideration here.

20. The statement to be considered here is : "God is one; and that too without a second." This statement is capable of being interpreted in two ways; and these two ways arise from the two ways in which the word "second" is interpreted. If by the word "second" is meant a second God, the statement means that there is only one God and there is no other God. In other words, there are no two Gods; but there can be entities other than God. The dualistic philosophers like Śrī-Madhvācārya adopt this interpretation. If, however, by the word "seeond" is menat a second entity, the statement means that God is the only Ultimate substance in the universe. In other

words, there is no entity other than God, God is the only entity in the universe. This is the interpretation adopted by monistic philosopher like Śrī–Vallabhācarya. There is one extreme view as regards the second interpretation. And this extreme view arises from the logical limitation, namely, one is always one and is never two. Śrī–Śaṁkarācarya takes this extreme view. According to him, everything other than this one Ultimate Substance, which may happen to appear, is only apparent and not real. Take for instance a rope lying in semi-darkness. A rope is a rope. It cannot become a serpent. One thing canot become another. The serpent that appears instead of the rope is only apparent and not real, Śrī–Vallabhācarya does not go to this extreme. According to him the other substance is a modification of the first. An illustration will serve to make the point clear. Suppose for argument's sake that water is the ultimate substance. Now ice which is a modification of water appears as ice and not as water i.e. it appears as something other than water. So according to Śrī–Śaṁkarācarya, it is apparent and not real. In other words, it does not exist at all. But, according to Śrī–Vallabhācarya, it is a modification of water, it is water itself in another form, and it is as real as water.

21. Though not very relevant, the first interpretation may be discussed in detail as it has got some philosophical importance. According to this interpretation, there can be only one God and not two. Why so can be shown as below :

Above, we have shown that God fulfils a philosophical necessity. To explain satisfactorily our notions of infinite power, infinite knowledge, and infinite goodness, we have to postulate some such entity endowed with these qualities; and we have for convenience sake termed this entity "God". For our present purpose, the consideration of the first of these three qualities is quite sufficient, and this quality is infinite power. Now suppose there are two Gods, quite distinct from each other. For convenience sake let

us call them A and B. Now they are distinct, so their powers also are distinct. Take for instance two flowers. Both of them have fragrance, but the fragrance of one is quite distinct from that of the other. They are similar but not the same. In the same way, the power of A is not power of B and the power of B is not the power of A. Now, if A lacks the power of B, his power becomes finite; and the same is the case with B, for by infinate we mean all-comprehensive. Next, if there are two Gods distinct from and independent of each other, they are at some time bound to have different wishes; and to gratify them, both being powerful, they are bound to quarre; and this quarrel would either be eternal or would end with the triumph of one and the defeat of the other. In the first case, there would remain no hope for eternal peace which all of us hanker after; and in the second case the triumphant God remains the only God. We, who hanker after eternal peace, would prefer the second alternative to the first, and admit that there cannot be two Gods, each having infinite power.

22. Now, leaving aside the extreme view of the second interpretation, according to which anything appearing different from the Ultimate Reality is altogether non-existent, as it is not very relevant to our purpose, we may consider at some length that view which Śrī-Vallabhācārya has adopted. According to this view, God is the only real substance; and other substances are only modifications of God, and as such are as real as God. Ice and steam do exist. They have not the appearance of water; they appear somewhat different from the water, Nevetheless they in substance are not no-water. They are only the different forms of self-same water. They are water but only in a different form. When an ingot of gold is given the shape of an ornament, it does not cease to be gold. There is the change of form only and not of substance. From these instances, we may turn to God, the Ultimate Substance. Besides God about whom we ordinarily know only through the Vedas or similar other works of revealation, we find two

other substances unmistakably presented to our healthy senses. They are animate souls and inanimate substances. According to this second interpretation, these animate souls and inanimate are but the modification of that self-same one God. In other words, they are that one God in different forms, as is the case with ice and steam which are the self-same water in different forms. Why so ? There is some capacity inherent in water which enables it to become ice and steam. We have to admit it because we see it. The same is true of this one God of Scriptures, who possesses an infinite number of powers. One of these inherent infinite powers enables God to assume any form he likes. In this connection Śrī–Vallabhācārya's dictum,

"Sarva–bhāva–samarthatvād
Acintyaiśavaryavad Bṛhat." [19]

meaning "The Ultimate Entity can assume all forms whatsoever. As such its powers are simply incomprehensible," very well expresses this idea.

23. Relying on the Vedas, Śrī–Vallabhācārya believes that in the beginning i.e. before this Creation came into existence, the Ultimate Reality was the only entity; and it was this one Ultimate Reality which became many. And it is this act of becoming many that is responsible for the coming into existence of this Creation. Now this fact of creation also when closely considered lends rational support to the doctrine of Śuddhādvaita or Pure Monism.

24. Now, look at this creation ! It is not so simple an object as a pot made by a potter. And even to make a pot is not an easy thing. To make such a pot also requires a lot of skill, time, and trouble, and a fairly long process as well. Now, looking to the universe, we find in it, first of all, the most wonderful design, the most wonderful order, the most wonderful self-operating processes, the most wonderful self-enforcing laws. still more wonderful psychological entites like intellect, intuition, will, emotion, and so on and so forth. Looking to all

this, do we not feel that this universe is simply wonder incarnate? Next think of the entity, whether personal or impersonal, that has brought about all this! Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya in his Śārīraka Bhāṣya on the Brahma-sūtras, in this connection, writes to the effect that, looking to the universe, one finds in it an infinite variety of names and forms, an infinite variety of persons who incessantly go on doing something or another, an equally infinite variety of persons voluntarily engaged in pursuit and enjoyment of pleasures or involuntarily suffering a lot of pain, and over and above all these, strict laws governing time, space, and the various events taking place therein; and then adds that it is impossible to conceive mentally even how all this comes to pass, with the further remark that one that is responsible for all this must certainly be omniscient and omnipotent.[20] Śrī-Vallabhācārya also in the same context writes to the effect that, to create without the least effort this universe wherein we find a number of elements, organisms, gods, men, beasts, and innumerable wonderfully designed worlds, to sustain it, and again to dissolve it, is certainly not ordinary.[21]

25. Now, there arises a very important question : A potter makes a pot out of clay. A goldsmith makes ornaments out of gold. Out of what, then, does the Creator create this universe ? Without clay the potter is helpless. For, without it he cannot make a pot. Similarly, the goldsmith cannot make ornaments without gold. Moreover, the potter requires a wheel; and the goldsmith his tools. Without these also they can do nothing. Does the Creator too then requires any tools with which to fashion the universe? The clay and the wheel are other than the potter; the gold and the tools are other than the goldsmith. Now, if the Creator were to need a material like clay or gold; or were to depend on instruments like the potter's wheel or the goldsmith's tools, would it not curtail his independence to that excent? How would this be compatible with his infinite power or omnipotence? Śrī-Madhvācārya

very forcefully brings out this aspect of the Almighty in the following stanza;

"Paratantro hyapekṣeta;
Svatantraḥ kim apekṣate ?
Sādhanānām Sādhanatvam
Yataḥ kim tasya Sādhanaiḥ ?"[22]

where it is stated : One who is not independent may have to depend on other factors. But would one who is absolutely independent have to depend on them ? On the contrary, these very factors have to depend on God. Would such a God have to depend on such factors which by themselves without this God can do nothing ? The following parable from the Kenopaniṣad is highly instructive in this connection :

Once upon a time, gods won a very great victory. This victory was won simply through the Grace of God who always works and helps imperceptibly. The gods, however, thought that it was won through their own valour; and on account of it began to hold their heads high. God, the Almighty, out, of infinite grace, wanted to bring them back to their senses. Accordingly, he assumed a mysterious form and appeared before them. The gods in order to know what this mysterious being was first sent Agni, the god of fire. When Agni approached God, God asked him, "Who are you and what type of power do you possess ?" "Agni am I; and I can reduce to ashes whatever comes in my way, even if it be the whole of this Earth" said he. Then God held forth a bit of straw and asked Agni to burn it. Agni exerted his utmost, but was unable to burn it. He felt dejected and returned to the gods disappointed. Next came the turn of Vayu, the god of wind, and Indra, the god of rain. But they too shared the same fate. Thereafter God disappeared; and there appeared a women of exquisite beauty, who taught the gods that the mysterious being was no other than God the Almighty, through whose grace alone they had won their victory. In this way they

learnt what the true state of things is.[23] Would such an Almighty God require the help of other factors?

26. Śrī-Vallabhācārya in his Aṇu Bhāṣya on the Samanvaya-Sūtra of the Brahma-Sūtras[24] has discussed this point. And there he says : When it has been shown that Brahman, i. e., God or the Ultimate Reality, has created the universe, the following questions necessarily arise : Is this Brahman the material cause only, or the instrumental cause only, or merely an agent depending on these two causes ? If it were all in one, there would be no difficulty whatsoever. But, if it were only one of them, that would render it helpless in the absence of any one of the other two factors. It would be in a line with clay which by itself cannot take the shape of a pot, or with the potter's wheel which by itself is quite useless, or like the potter who can do nothing without the other two. To escape from such an undesirable contigency, we are compelled to believe that God, the Creator, is all in one; and that He, creates the universe out of himself without any extraneous help whatsoever. And the Śruti passage,

"Sa ātmānam svayam akuruta"[25]

states this very thing. In this way also the fact of creation by God the omnipotent lends rational support to the doctrine of Suddhādvaita or Pure Monism. Incidentally, the difference between the Kevalādvita or Absolute Monism of Śri-Śaṁkarācarya and the Śuddhādvıta or Pure Monism of Śri-Vallabhācārya, may with advantage be pointed out here. According to the latter, the world being a modification of the Ultimate Realiy is as real as the Ultimate Reality. A gold ornament is not less gold and less real than an ingot of gold. According to the former, however, the Ultimate Reality is incapable of any modification, so the world is merely an appearance and not a reality.

27. Now one more consideration also favours Suddhādvaita. And this is the considertion of the state of 'Abhaya' or fearlessness. Fearlessness is the first requiste of spiritual life, the essential constituent whereof is perfect peace, the peace which nothing can disturb, Late American President Roosevelt, it is reported, used to say that the only thing one need fear is fear itself. Bhagavadgītā, while enumerating spiritual virtues, places this 'Abhaya' at the head of the list.[26] The goal of all spirtual pursuits, according to the Upaniṣads is 'Abhaya.' Take for instance the following passages :

"Abhayam vai Janaka prāptosi iti hovāca yājnavalkyaḥ"[27] meaning "Oh Janaka, you have reached the state of perfect fearlessness' so said Yājñavalkya."

> "Sa vā eṣa mahān ajaḥ Ātmā ajaraḥ, amrtaḥ,
> abhayaḥ Brahma. Abhayam vai Brahma."[28]

meaning "When this very soul, which is potentially great and unborn (i. e., eternally existing) rises above old age and death, it itself is God who is absolutely free from fear. This very fearlessness is itself Godhead."

28. Now, in this connection, we find in the Upaniṣads, a very sigificant passage :

> "Saḥ abibhet. Tasmāt ekāki bibheti. Saḥ ayam
> īksāṁcakre : Yan mad anyat nāsti, kesmān nu
> bibhemi iti. Tataḥ eva asya bhayam vīyāya.
> Kasmāt hi abheṣyat. Dvitīyad vai bhayam bhavati."[29]

meaning "That God (whene alone i.e. before he created this universe) felt afraid. That is why a person when alone feels afraid. But (the very next moment) it occured to Him : 'Why should I feel afraid since there is nobody here except myself ?' This thought instantly drove away His fear. Why should He

have felt afraid ? The feeling of fear is caused by the presence of another." This analysis of the nature of fear is really wonderful. This shows how keen the psychological insight of the Upaniṣadic Seers was. If we closely study this passage, two points clearly emerge : not only do we feel afraid, but we want at the same time to become free from that fear. This feeling of fear can be compared to the state of our ignorance. This state of ignorance is not a state of bliss for us. We have an inborn desire to get out of it. Our curiosity is a mild form of this desire. At the root of all scientific and philosophic progress, it is this desire in an intense form. If, however, in spite of our desire to get out of this state of ignorance, we acquiesce into it, it is simply because we are unable to get out of it. In this matter we are like a person caught in a morass. It is not that he stays there because he is happy there. It is simply because of his helplessness that he continues to remain there. The same is the case with us. Our inborn curiosity, our strenuous efforts to acquire more and more of knowledge, and our subconscious dissatisfaction with the state of ignorance in which we happen to be—all these point to the fact that the ideal state of our soul is that where there is all light and no darkness. Coming to the feeling of fear, we can say the same thing. That we feel afraid is a definite fact of our nature. There are a number of fears lurking in our heart. We are, however, fortunate that they generally do not come up to the level of consciousness. Otherwise our life would have been unbearably miserable. And it is just in this connection that it has been said "Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise." In spite all this the fact that we want to get out of this feeling of fear and subconsciously we desire to have that state of absolute fearlessness is equally true. But this ideal state of absolute fearlessness is possible only if the Ultimate Reality is one without a second. Thus Śuddhādvaita, the state of one without a second becomes a philosophical necessity when we consider it from the viewpoint of fear-complex.

29. The consideration of the problem of evil of also leads us in this direction. Barring Illusionists who believe everything to be unreal except the underlying substratum without which the very illusion becomes impossible, all Vedāntic philosophers believe that the evil does exist, believing at the same time that God or the Ultimate Reality is fully free from all evil, nirdoṣa. As long as this free-from-all-evil God is kept aloof from the universe no trouble can arise. The God of Jainism is just like this. He is not at all-responsible for anything good or bad in the universe. The inexorable Law of Karma, in this eternal universe, with innumerable individual, ignorant, eternally existing souls, will explain everything either good or bad in this universe. God is nothing but one or other, of these souls, that has freed himself from all evil. Not God but past acts of individual souls are responsible for anything good or bad in their lives. But, for the Theists who believe God to be the whole and sole in this universe and according to whom not even a blade of grass can move without His will, it is not so easy to absolve Him from all evil. Had there been no evil in this universe, had this universe been as free from all evil as God, no trouble would have arisen at all. But unfortunately, this is, however, not the case. The case is just the opposite. Evil we meet with at every step in this universe. There is a lot of misery; there is a lot of partiality; there is a lot of cruelty. And all these are found not in a tolerable degree but in a degree extremely shocking. There is nothing wrong if we go to the length of saying that evil is the law and good an exception in this universe and thus acquiesce into it. But, then, how shall we justify our instinctive desire to get over the evil? It is a patent fact that all sensible persons intensely desire to get away and free themselve from this evil. They leave no stone unturned in their efforts to secure this freedom. So it is no use either acquiescing into it or totally denying it.

30. Other Vedāntācāryas have tried in their own way to solve this problem of evil. Their primary concern is not so much

to explain the evil in this universe as to protect the Ultimate Reality or God from it. Śri-Śaṁkarācārya sweeps the platform clean by denying this evil altogether. According to him, this very world has got no existence, much less the evil therein. If the very rope-serpent (a rope believed to be a serpant in the dark) does not exist, much less the poison in its fang. As the rope remains absolutety untouched by the rope-serpent and its supposed poison, so his God or Brahman (by which name he prefers to call his God) too is absolutely free from the world (super-imposed on this Brahman) and the evil supposed to be therein, but in reality not existing at all. As for Śrī-Rāmānujācārya, the souls and the world constitute God's body. So just as the soul remains untouched by the defects of the body, so God remains untouched by the evil either in the souls or in the world. So his God also is free from the evil. As for Śrī-Madhvācārya, God, the souls, and the world are three distinct entities, so his God also is absolutely free from all evil. The real problem is from the Sudhhādhvaita point of view of Śrī-Vallabhācārya. According to him the souls are the real and not supposed parts of God; and the world is in reality nothing but God in another form, as the ornaments are nothing but gold in another form. As such the evil in the souls and in the world is as much his as theirs. The body cannot remain free from the defects of the leg. If the leg is lame, the body is bound to limp; it cannot escape from that defect. If the golden ornament receives scratches, the gold in it is bound to have them also and it cannot remain free from them. So it is not the other Vedāntācāryas, but it is rather Śrī-Vallabhācārya that has to face the full force of the fire point-blank. And he fully meets the challenge and in the way which is unique in the whole field of Indian philosophical thought; for so far as my knowledge goes it is not to be found anywhere else.

31. For a full appreciation of the way in whi ch Śrī-Vallabhācārya solves this problem of evil, let us first state it at some length. According to Srī-Vallabhācārya, God is both the

material as well as the eficient cause of the universe. Taking God to be the material cause of the universe, we have to believe that He Himself has become the universe in the same way as clay becomes a pot. Then just as clay and the pot are one, so God and the universe are one. Now if there is evil in the universe, it is as much in God as in the universe because they are one. Next, taking God to be the efficient cause, we have to believe that He is responsible for all the evil in the universe. The misery and the cruelty in this universe are all due to Him. Such a God ceases to be God who is free from all defects. It is in this way that the non-theistic philosophers assail the theistic ones. They say: Some are very happy, e.g., the denizens of heaven; and others very unhappy, e.g., the denizens of hell. And even for one who denies such imaginary heaven and hell, there is a lot of happiness and unhappiness in this day-to-day world of our actual experience. Although unmixed ideal happiness is not to be found anywhere upon this earth, yet the disparity is to be found in a marked degree. Some are relatively extremely happy, whereas the lot of others is relatively extremely wretched. If all this is due to God, is He not open to the charge of partiality? How can He boast of His impartiality? In the Bhagavadgita he says:

"Samo' ham sarva-bhūteṣu, na me dveṣyo' sti na priyah"[30]

meaning "I am impartial towards all creatures. No one do I hate; no one do I love." But if God is responsible for this disparity and the differential treatment of creatures, these words of His become a meaningless idle boast. Moreover, if God is all-kind and a veritable ocean of grace, why should He permit so much cruelty in the universe? For dualistic philosophers this is not a serious problem at all. Their theory is: God is God, and the Universe is the Universe. They are eternally separate. All good belongs to God, and all evil belongs to the universe. To explain the disparity they bring

in the different Karmas or actions of the different souls. God is not responsible for them. He is merely an administrator, a dispenser of justice. He is impartial in the real sense of the term. According to Śrī-Vallabhācārya such a God, however, ceases to be God as He has no freedom whatsoever of action. He is always bound by the Law of Karma. If He is bound by Law, how is He free? If He is not free, how can He free others ? And if He cannot free others, what is the use of approaching Him for securing freedom? Moreover, the dualistic theory is incompatible with the omnipotence of God as has been shown in foregoing pages. So the challenge has to be met with from purely non-dualistic point of view. And Śrī-Vallabhācārya does it both ably and admirably.

32. He boldly says :

"Ātmasṛṣṭer na vaiṣamyam
Nairghṛnyam cāpi vidyate"[31]

meaning "Because God himself has become universe, and the universe is nothing but God Himself, either partiality or cruelty has no scope whatsoever." This is how he frees his God completely from every taint of evil. **There is a real evil from our dualistic point no doubt. And if we want to be absolutely happy, we have to go on shunning this evil, and we have to goon and on doing so till that very evil ceases to be evil altogether.** But from God's strictly non-dualistic point of view, there is no possibility whatsoever of any evil in the form of partiality and cruelty. How this is so will be clear form the following few considerations. The evil attaching to God appears in two forms : cruelty, and partiality. Of these two, let us first analyse the nature of partiality. Now, even a slight thought will reveal that partiality requires at least three intelligent persons; for an unintelligent object is never open to any charge. At the most it is neutral. It is good if you make a good use of it, and bad if you make a bad use of it. A, one person, can be charged with partiality if he favours B, another person, and

not C, a third person. Has such partiality any scope whatsoever in Śuddhādvaita, Pure Monism, where there is only one Ultimate Substance and that too without a second? In the same way, cruelty requires at least two persons. A, one person, is cruel to B, another person, if the former ill-treats the latter. But has such cruelty also any scope in such a Pure Monism? Moreover A cannot be cruel to himself, according to the maxim,

"Nāgner hi tāpo na himasya tat syāt"[32]

meaning: The heat of fire is not painful to fire itself, nor the coldness of ice is painful to ice itself. Next let us turn to the nature of evil itself. As stated above a thing cannot be evil to itself. So what scope is there for any evil whatsoever in the Śuddhādvaita System of Vedānta as envisaged by Śrī-Vallabhācārya?

33. To drive the truth of this doctrine home a funny instance may be cited with advantage. Our body is one. Althongh it is made up of many parts, we never feel that it is many. Now, we always hold our head high above and keep our feet down below. But have we ever had even the slightest idea that we are open to the charge of partiality on account of the differential treatment of these two limbs? And if some other person were to charge us that way, would we mind him? and, in order to absolve ourselves from that charge, would we keep our legs high above and our head down below at least even for a few days? Śrī-Rāmānujācārya would have with advantage utilized this illustration. For, according to him, the souls and world constitute God's body.

34. By this time, it has been made sufficiently clear that this System of Śuddhādvaita Vedānta not only finds full Vedic support, but it has at the same time full ration justification. For first of all it completely satisfies the instinctive

internal hankering after some one unifying principle behind all these diverse phenomena of our world of experience; and next, it alone makes abhaya or absolute freedom from all fear possible. Moreover, not only does it absolve God from all taint of evil retaining at the same time his Godhead immaculate, but it is also in complete consonance with the idea of One Omnipotent Creator. Having dwelt so much on this one, the most important of all, aspect of the Ultimate Reality, we may safely turn to other aspects thereof.

---

## CHAPTER IV

### OTHER ASPECTS :

1. After dwelling at some length on the most important aspect of the Ultimate Reality. namely, that it is one and without a second, we may with advantage consider the following few aspects thereof too :

- (i) This Ultimate Reality is infinite and all-comprehensive.
- (ii) The diverse names and forms to be found in this universe are but the manifestations of the self-same Ultimate Entity. In other words that One Ultimate Entity has become Many.
- (iii) The powers of this Ultimate Reality are simply incomprehensible. And one very peculiar characteristic of this aspect is the fact that even the mutually conflicting qualities can reside together in it.
- (iv) This Ultimate Reality is endowed with all divine qualities. In other words, it is not attribute-less as some other philosophers are disposed to think.
- (v) The Ultimate Reality in both personal and impersonal. And the personal aspect repeatedly incarnates itself.
- (vi) All this activity is only a sport on the part of this Ultimate Reality.

2. Let us start with the first aspect, according to which, the Ultimate Reality is infinite and all-comprehensive Śrī-Vallabhācārya in his Tattva-dīpa-Nibandha describes the Ultimate Reality in the following manner. And it will give us a good idea of its infinite and all-comprehensive nature :

"The Ultimate Reality is Eternal Truth, Infinite knoweldge, and Infinite Joy. It is the greatest, i. e. greater than any thing however great that we can think of. It is everywhere. It is unchanging. It is omnipotent. It is quite independent, i e., though everything in this universe depends on it, it depends on none. It is omniscient. It is independent of the Prakirta-Guṇas, namely. Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas. On the other hand, these Guṇas themselves depend on it. In other words, these three Guṇas govern the universe, but they in turn are governed by this Ultimate Reality. It is one without difference, whether it be Sajātīya, Vijātiya, or Svagata. [The difference between one male and another is Sajātīya, i. e., one between the two members of the same class. That between a male and a female is Vijātīya, i.e., one between two individuals belonging to two different classes. And that between the various limbs of the same body is Svagata, i.e., one between the different parts of one organism. The Ultimate Reality in its essence admits of none of these differences.] It is eternally and inherently endowed with an infinite number of virtues. It sustains everything. The limitless power is ever ready at its beck and call. [ Māyā, in the System of Śrī-Vallabhācārya, is this limitless power of the Ultimate Reality, wherewith it accomplishes anything whatsoever without the least exertion on its part. ] It is all Bliss. It is the Best, the Highest both materially as well as spiritually. It can very easily be distinguished from all the objects to be found in this universe. It is the material as well as the efficient cause of the universe. At times it carries its sport inside itself; at others it does so outside itself

in the universe. Every such sport delights it. This Ultimate Reality controls both the sentient souls as well as the non-sentient objects in this universe. It is endowed with powers which are infinite and incomprehensible. The space, the time, the manner, the matter, the instrument, the reason, the owner, the receiver, and what not? Every one of these is the manifestation of this Ultimate Reality. It is everwhere. It is at the heart of everything. It controls everything; and that too automatically without even touching it. It is the soul of all. Everything constitutes its body, yet nothing knows it. It is from within everything that it shines forth. **Put all the systems of philosophy together, whether past; present, or future. They will not comprehend it completely. None is, however, wrong as it correctly comprehends some one or more of the different aspects of this Ultimate Reality**. Its forms are infinite. It is changeless and also changing at the same time. It is the only repository of all conflicting qualities. It is intellectually incomprehensible. It indulges in revealing and concealing itself from time to time. In this way, it manifests and again takes back into itself a number of forms in so rapid a succession that our intellect trying to know it simply gets confounded. It cannot ordinarily be grasped by means of sense-organs. Nevertheless, if it but wills so, it can be so grasped."[1]

Herein we find a very clear picture of the Ultimate Reality as conceived by Śrī-Vallabhācārya. And it does ample justice to the infinite and incomprehensible nature of the Ultimate Reality.

3. Next we may turn to the rational consideration thereof. And for this we have to dive deep into the enlightened human nature Itself. We are conscious of our ignorance. There is a deep-seated urge within us to know more. We are not satisfied with half-knowledge. As far as we can, we want to have an exact knowledge and that too fully. This full and exact knowledge of various things. even when we have it to our

satisfaction, presents a very diversified picture of the universe. Not that this diversity does not delight us. Nevertheless, we yearn for some simple principle unifying all these diverse phenomena. We want to have a very simple yet at the same time a very comprehensive principle that can explain all these diverse phenomena. The beauty of the theory of Albert Einstein, of course in the field of physics, lies just in this. Such a theory is an approximate description of the Ultimate Reality which governs all. Any intellectual pursuit whether scientific or philosophical is an attempt to get nearer and nearer to it. The nearer and nearer we get to it, the greater and greater is our progress. And in the following lines of the auther of the 'Student's-History of Philosophy' we get a very beautiful picture of this progress :

"When we at the present time first begin to think about the world in a conscious and systematic way, we discover that our thought already has a tendency to follow certain general lines, which seem to us natural, and sometimes almost inevitable. We find ourselves familiar, e.g., with the conception of a world of nature – a world wherein lifeless and unconscious bits of matter group themselves according to unvarying laws. There are a multitude of words which we use in speaking of this material world-thing or substance, cause and effect, force, law, mechanism, necessity; and we suppose, ordinarily, that these words convey a well-defined and obvious meaning. In like manner, there is the very different world of the mental or conscious life, described by such terms as will, intellect, feeling, sensation. This also has laws which it follows; only they are what we call psychological, or logical, or ethical laws, in opposition to the physical laws of the outer world. Finally, while there is no general agreement in our ultimate religious or philosophical attempts to sum up the facts of reality, here too there are a few main attitudes, or types of theory, within which our choice is confined, and which go by such names as dualism, theism, idealism, materialism, pantheism, agnosticism. We do not find it very difficult to understand in a general

way what these words mean, even if we do not accept the theories for which they stand.

"These concepts, then, or notions which we frame to serve as short-hand expressions for certain facts, or aspects of reality, come to us with so little labour on our part, that we often are tempted to regard them as self-evident and certain to present themselves as the manifest points of view whenever men stop to think. But a little examination will show that this is a mistake. We are the heir of all the ages in our intellectual life, and so can utilize the results of those who have gone before us. ...

"The History of Philosophy attempts to give an account of the more important and comprehensive of these conceptions, in terms of which we are accustomed to think of the world, and to trace the mental and social conditions out of which they took their rise. It is an account of the growth of man's power to formulate the universe. ...When the subject-matter of investigation is so enormous, we can only expect to approach the goal by zigzag courses, hitting now upon the one aspect of the world, now upon another. In two obvious ways, nevertheless, we may look for an advance. It may consist simply in bringing to light some new point of view which before had been neglected, in abstracting some aspect of things which had not hitherto been clearly isolated from the rest of experience. Or, instead of striking out such a new conception, we may try to combine more organically those which the past history of philosophy has already succeeded in elaborating. ... **Each of these standpoints represents some significant feature which the world presents; and it is not till all the manifoldness of the world has been distinguished, and grasped in an intellectual form, that we are in a position to sum up our knowledge so that it shall fairly represent the truth."**[2]

Now, compare the bold typed portion above with that in Srī-Vallabhācārya's description of the Ultimate Reality, which is as follows :

"Put all the systems of philosophy together, whether past, present, or future. They will not comprehend it (i. e., the Ultimate Reality) completly. None is, however, wrong as it correctly comprehends some one or more of the different aspects of this Ultimate Reality.."[3]

Do they not practically say the same thing? We can also with advantage compare the above lines with the following ones of Dr. Annie Besant :

".....each religion has its own special note, makes its own special contribution to the forces working for the evolution of man. As we notice their differences, in addition to their similarities, we feel that they reveal a plan of human education, just as when we hear a splendid chord we feel that a master-musician has combined the notes, with a full knowledge of the value of each. ..Surely the world is the richer for each, and we cannot spare one jewel from our chaplet of the world's religions."[4]

Variety is the spice of life. The various aspects of the Ultimate Reality serve to enhance its beauty. They are as much real as the Ultimate Reality itself. Śrī-Vallabhācārya respects all and rejects none. He simply seeks to assign every aspect its proper place in the master-plan. Ignorance, limited view, and pride prevent us from appreciating this rich variety. Humility combined with the openness of mind alone will enable one to fully appreciate the rich beauty of the various manifestations of One and the Same Ultimate Reality, which though One can become Many because of its intrinsic capacity to do so. And there is no end to this Multiplicity. The infinite nature of the Ultimate Reality is on close consideration found to be three-fold. This Ultimate Reality is found to be infinite in time, space, and substance. By saying that the Ultimate Reality (usually called Brahman) though One becomes Many, and that this Many has no end, we mean to say that the Ultimate Reality is infinite in substance. This means that it will go on becoming many, and go on and on doing so till the very end

of time if there is such an end, but the substance of the Ultimate Reality will never get exhausted. And it is this fact that has been mentioned in the famous Upaniṣadic dictum.

"Pūrṇasya Pūrṇam ādāya Pūrṇam evāvaśiṣyate."[5]
meaning–Even though the Ultimate Reality has multiplied itself infinitely, yet its capacity to do so is not exhausted, this capacity has remained intact. That it is infinite in time is saying the samething that it is eternal, that it did exist at all times in the past, it does exist at present and it will continue to do so at all times in the future. In other words, it exists at all times and even beyond. In still other words, it is never non-existent. Of destruction it knows nothing. And to say that this Ultimate Reality is infinite in space means that it is inside space, it is outside space, and that it is even beyond space. In other words, there is no place either spiritual or material where this Ultimate Reality is not already there. This fact of the infinite nature of the Ultimate Reality finds a very eloquent expression in the following lines giving the outlines of Śrı-Aurobindo Ghosh's Vedāntic Philosophy, who is a devotee of the Ultimate Reality in its feminine aspect:

"There are three ways of Her being in which it is possible to be aware of Her. She has three statuses :

"Transcendent, She is above all the worlds, linking the Supreme Being to all creation. She it is who bears the Supreme in Her Consciousness, calls and holds the truths to be manifested and casts them into form. ...

"Universal, she spreads herself out as the substance and the soul of each universe of Her creation. It is Her presence that gives life and meaning to All, Her movement that gives the direction.

"Individual, She embodies in Herself both the transcendent and the univesal ways of Her existence and makes their Power

operative here for the manifestation of the Divine in each individual form. She descends in person into the world of Ignorance in order to uplift and release it from the Falsehood and obscurity into which it has sunk.

"The Divine Mother has many aspects, many personalities that severally express the plenitude of Her oceanic Being."[6]

The above lines eloquently express the infinite and all-comprehensive nature of the Ultimate Reality as directly visualised by a great seer, Śrī-Aurobindo Ghosh, on this very earth in this very life. And does this picture in any way differ from that given by Śrī-Vallabhācārya? Thus, according to him, the Ultimate Reality, thought One, is nevertheless capable of becoming infinitely Many. Any view of this Ultimate Reality falls short of it because whereas this Ultimate Reality is infinite, any such view is bound to be finite, because the mind that conceives it is limited and the language which describes it is still more limited. That does not mean that any such view is wrong. No finite thing is unreal because of its finitude. The finitude of anything is due more to the faulty nature of our own perceiving apparatus, our limited mind. We think such a thing to be unreal because it slips away from before us. Such a thing appears to be unreal not because it is unreal but because we are unable to hold it on. This is because we are ordinarily so constituted that we ascribe our faults to others. While travelling in a train we think that the things around us are moving. But what is moving in reality? The things around us or we ourselves? We see the Sun go from East to West? But do we ever see that the earth on which we live goes from West to East? To cite an illustration from psychology, let us take the following instance : Suppose after a lot of mental effort we arrive at the solution of a very difficult mathematical or philosophical problem, and we forget it the next day. Whose fault is it? Ours or of the problem? The same is the case when we think that the objects of our experience are finite or unreal. When the spiritual powers are

developed, we begin to have a wider and wider vision. And thereafter our ordinary views are completely changed. Thus we see how Śrī-Vallabhācārya views the Ultimate Reality.

4. Now, let us take up the next aspect. According to this, the diverse names and forms are but the different manifestations of the self-same One Ultimate Reality. For the clear description of this aspect also, we can very well have a recourse to the following lines outlining the Vedāntic Philosophy of Śrī-Aurobindo Ghosh :

"The Divine has projected the universe out of His own Being with a purpose. That purpose is to manifest Himself, His inalienable nature of Existence, Consciousness, and Bliss, sac-cid-ananda. ...

" ... He is there in every creature, in every point of Space and in every moment of Time, supporting all as the **sadatman**, an impersonal Self. All are Names and Forms on the bosom of this Self.

" ... Not only are all things in the Self, but the Self too is in all of them. It is That which makes the Names and Forms live and real.

" ... It is He who has put out this universe from the infinitude of His being."[7]

The view of Śrī-Vallabhācārya is also just the same. Now, let it be humbly admitted at the outset, that is not possible to demonstrate all this. And the very Revelation, the Veda itself, humbly admits its inability to do so :

"Yato vāco nivartante Aprāpya manasā saha"[8]

Neither the words nor the mind can reach it. It is, like the health of the body, something to be felt; and not something to be seen by ourselves or to be shown to others. At best it can

be described but not demonstrated. But in order to dilute the dogmatic character thereof, the matter may be presented as rationally as possible.

5. To do so let us consider the following : Let us suppose that there are four objects A, B, C, D all different from one another. That all of them are different is a fact. But does the thing end there? Is there not anything common to all of them? Let us examine them much more closely. We know that A is, B is, C is, and D is. Is not the fact of this is-ness common to all? If it is so, it comprehends all the four. Thus this is-ness becomes comprehensive. Again, does the matter end with this is-ness? Where is this is-ness if we have no knowledge thereof? Then this knowledge becomes still more comprehensive. It comprehends the is-ness over and above A, B, C and D. But the thing does not end even here. After knowing a thing, either we like or dislike it. And these likes and dislikes constitute the very dynamics of all activity whether physical or mental. If the all-comprehensive Reality has to be sought in this world of our experience, it is to be sought in these three directions. That is why the Śruti describes Brahman or the Ultimate Reality as sac-cid-ānanda, Existence, Knowledge, and Bliss. These to a limited extent are to be found even in the universe. But in Brahman they are infinite. And incidentally it may be mentioned that it is because of this very wide and rational conception of the Ultimate Reality or God that the Indian Religion has become most tolerant. In every finite object, these three are always present. And the degree thereof in each will decide which is a greater and which is a lesser manifestation of the Ultimate Reality. But one fact emerges very clearly that all objects are the manifestations of the Ultimate Reality. And this fact admits of no exception. It is just because of this that the Indian Religion respects all alike. The famous Gita dictum.

"Vāsudevaḥ sarvam iti
Sa mahātmā sudurlabhaḥ"[9]

boldly declares that God is everything and everything is God, stating at the same time that persons having so lofty a vision are very very rare. Moreover this spirit of veneration and worship is much more important than the object of such veneration and worship. A person may worship any object he likes. For him that object is all right. But the belief that that object alone will liberate, and the others will not, is foreign to the Spirit of Indian Religion. **It is the worship that liberates and not the object.** This is the cardinal principle of the Indian Religion. The well-known stanza :

> "Kāṣṭhe na vidyate devo,
>
> Na śilāyām na mṛṇmaye;
>
> Bhāvena vidyate devo,
>
> Tasmād bhāvo hi Kāraṇam."[10]

meaning "God resides neither in wood, nor in stone, nor in clay. But he resides there because of the spirt of veneration which a devotee has towards it. So this spirit of veneration alone counts and nothing else." Very beautifully enunciates this principle. Worships any object you like. But worship it or follow it wholeheartedly, i.e., surrendering yourself unconditionally. The Indian Religion does not believe in Religious conversion as generally understood. It aims at only one thing : Be better. Let Hindus be better Hindus, Mohammedans better Mohammedans, and Christians better Christians. The Indian Religion reveres a sincere Mohammedan or Christian more than an insincere Hindu. According to the Indian Religion it is the sincerity which matters and not the form of belief. **Behaviour and not belief constitutes the very core of Real Religion.** Such a Religion ALONE can be truly democratic.

6. The point to be considered next is how this One Ultimate Reality becomes Many. As has already been stated no demon-stration is here possible. But a rational explanation based on analogies can be held forth, admitting of course that an analogy

is no argument; as there is no guarantee that what happens in one case also happens in another. Nevertheless it will dispel the idea that a particular happening is impossible, which we are disposed to think when that particular happening happens to be unusual. Moreover it should not be forgotten that whatever is here stated with regard to the Ultimate Reality derives its strength from the Revelation and not from Reason. Here the Reason is merely a hand-maid of Revelation. It merely shows that the matters mentioned in the Revelation which in our ignorance we are disposed to think as impossible are not altogether impossible in the universe. Coming to the point, take first the instance of air. Is is chemically one and the same. But, physically, vibrations of different frequencies do arise in it, which give rise to different notes. Further the different permutations and combinations of these notes give rise to an infinite variety of chords either full of harmony or of discord. The former constitute the sweetest music but the latter happen to be jarring to our ears. How and why all this? Is there any satisfactory answer to this? We accept the thing as it is. Next, let us consider the case of electricity. Electrons and protons are its ultimate constituents. They are physically the same everywhere. They combine in different proportions; and the elements of Chemistry arise. These elements in turn combine in different proportions; and the chemical compounds arise. Moreover electricity is a form of energy. Does it not give rise to matter in this way? And does matter not exhibit properties which are quite distinct from those of energy? Moreover, does the energy in the form of matter not become a receptable of the energy in the form of energy, something like water in a cup of ice? How and why all this? Next, let us turn to biology. Take for instance the egg of a peacock. The juice inside it has one and the same colour. But, does not a few days' hatching turn this liquid into a solid young peacock having a plumage of the richest and the most variegated physical colours? How and why all this? To take another instance from the same science, let us

consider how a human body is formed. The male sperm and the female ovum combine giving rise to a protoplasm. This protoplasm becomes transformed into different cells, some of which can build only bones and others only blood. Who so? Further, all these give rise to the brain, the seat of the human mind, one of the most wonderful objects in the universe. This mind in its turn is a store-house of an infinite variety of ideas. These ideas again are both dependent on and independent of the objects outside, In the waking state, we see a book; and the idea of a book arises in our mind; but in a dream, there is no such book; nevertheless sometimes there does arise the idea of a book which in no way differs from that of the waking state. From all these instances it becomes amply clear that the fact of one becoming many together with the fact of that many having properties different from those of that one is not something impossible in Nature. It is in some such way that the Ultimate Reality which is One becomes Many. And, in this connection, it will be well to quote the following words of J. B. S. Haldane, an eminent British Scientist:

"However life originated in the remote past, more than a thousand million years ago, nowadays one living creature is always derived from another, or, in the case of sexual reproduction, from two others. **And there are good reasons to think that all or almost all living things were derived from a single original.**"[11]

7. Now let us turn to the third aspect. According to this, the powers of the Ultimate Reality are simply miraculous, i.e., such as cannot be comprehended by human intellect. And one very peculiar characteristic of this aspect is the fact that even the mutually conflicting qualities are to be found residing together therein. For the full grasp of this aspect, let us first turn to the nature of the Utlimate Reality as it to be had from the Vedic Scriptures, not only every part but even every

letter of which is equally authoritative according to the Orthodox Belief. Now, one Scriptural Passage

"Na cakṣuṣā gṛhyate"[12]

states that no eye can see this Ultimate Reality. But another

"Kaścid dhīraḥ pratyagātmānam aikṣat"[13]

states that some wise man did see it. A third passage

"Nāpi vācā"[14]

states that the words cannot describe it. But a fourth passage

"Sarve Vedā yat padam āmanati"[15]

states that all the Vedas describe it. And these Vedas are nothing but words. A fifth passage

"Aprāpya manasā saha"[16]

states that even mind can not reach it. But a sixth passage

"Manasaivedam āptavyam"[17]

states that it is with the help of the mind alone that this Ultimate Reality has to be reached. A seventh passage

"Agandham arasam"[18]

describes it as having neither smell nor taste. But an eighth passage :

"Sarvagandhaḥ sarvarasaḥ"[19]

speaks of it as having all smells and all tastes. And a number of similiar passages can be added to the list. Here we find conflicting qualities mentioned in different passages. But there are other passages where the conflicting qualities are to be found together in one and the same passage. Take, for instance, the passage

"Aṇoranīyan mahato mahīyān"[20]

meaning that this Ultimate Reality is smaller than the small and bigger than the big. Or the passage.

"Tad dūre tad u antike"[21]

meaning that this Ultimate Reality is both far as well as near. Innocent child-like faith may accept such conflicting statements no doubt. But can honest intelligence do so? To grasp well the difficulties of honest intelligence, let us take the following Laws of Thought into consideration. We shall find a very fine presentation thereof in the following lines Milton :

"Laws of Thought are certain fundamental and necessary principles which lie at the basis of reasoning. They are fundamental and necessary because they are assumed in all processes of reasoning exercised upon the facts of the real world, and because we cannot conceive them reverse or knowingly violate them. ...

"Since the time of Aristotle, three such principles or laws have been recognised : the **principal of identity,** the **principal of contradiction,** and the **principle of excluded middle.**

**"The Principle of Identity** - The simplest statement of this law is the formula **A. is A.** ...

**"The Principle of Contradiction** - This principle. which would be better named the prlnciple of non-contradiction, is most simply expressed by the formula **A cannot both be B and not be B.**

"...It denies that the same thing can, at the same time, both possess a certain attribute and not possess it; and, as thought must be self-consistent, that we can conceive a thing as at once both possessing and not possessing the same attribute. ...

"**The Principle of Excluded Middle** - The principle of excluded middle between two contradictory propositions is most clearly expressed by saying **A either is, 'or is not, B.**"[22]

Now, if the Scriptural Passages quoted above are all taken to be literally true, the Second Law of Thought is evidently violated. For, according to this law Brahman, i.e., the Ultimate Reality, is either such as can be seen or such as cannot be seen, it can never be both. But the Śruti, i.e., the Vedic Scripture, asserts that it is both. In such a contingency, either we have to disregard logic in order to respect both the sets of passages by accepting their literal meaning or to reject the literal meaning of one set of passages in order to be faithful to logic and thus to disregard that particular set of passages. Then let us see what the different exponents of the Śruti have done in the matter.

8. Let us start with Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya. He bases his Vedāntic doctrine on the Śruti-passage.

"Sad eva, Somya, idam agre āsid, ekam eva advitīyam"[23]

meaning "Oh gentle lad, in the beginning, i.e., at the time when this universe had not come into perceptible existence as yet, the Sat, i.e., the Ultimate Reality, alone existed the only one and that too without a second." He has followed the meaning of this Śruti-passage too literally. The best exposition of his Vedāntic doctrine is to be found in his following stanza :

"Na caikam tadanyad dvitīyam kutaḥsyāt,  
Na vā kevalatvam na cākevalatvam;  
Na śūnyam na caśūnyam advaitakatvat,  
Katham? Sarva-Vedānta-siddham bravīmi."[24]

meaning "As regards the Ultimate Reality, we cannot even say that it is one, How then can we say that there is something other besides it? We cannot even say that it is absolutely one. How then can we say that it is otherwise, i.e., not absolutely

one ? We cannot even say that is it completely non-existent. How then can we say that it is not completely non-existent ? How all this? Such a question need not be raised as what I have said has full support of all the Upaniṣads." Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya's Ultimate Principle is One Knowledge or Consciousness, pure and simple. There is not even the mental bifurcation of the knower and the thing known. For such a bifurcation is bound to destory absolute oneness. And the Śruti-passage means just such absolute oneness. To convey the oneness of the Ultimate Reality the word "eva" meaning "only" after "sat" was quite sufficient. Why should it pile up, otherwise, such words as "ekam eva, advitīyam" meaning "only one and that too without a second" ? The literal meaning of this Scriptural Passage and the Logical Second Law of Thought constitute the two colums on which Śri-Śaṁkarācārya's Philosophical Arch stands. The Śruti-passage says that the Ultimate Reality is one and the Logical Second Law of Thought says that if the Ultimate Reality is one, it is always one and never many. So the idea of Many is an illusion. The direct corollary of this doctrine is that this universe where we find a lot of diversity is an illusion. And Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya is so very staunch in this belief of his that he boldly defies even the Sūtrakāra. The occasion where he does so is as follows: The Sūtrakāra defines Brahman or Ultimate Reality as one that has created this universe. But this fact is assailed by the opponent in this way: Granted that Brahman has created this universe. Further, granted that this very Brahman has transformed itself into the form of this universe. Now, a crucial question arises : Has Brahman completely transformed itself into the form of this universe ? If so, nothing of Brahman remains behind. Then if liberation is the fruit of knowing Brahman, as nothing of Brahman has remained, how to know it and how to get consequent liberation pose a serious problem. And if liberation becomes impossible, good-bye to that Vedāntic doctrine which, instead of securing, directly destroys its goal. To escape such a contingency, if we believe that a part of Brahman has remained as Brahman in its perfect

purity, and only the remaining part has transformed itself into the form of the universe, this will make Brahman to be made of parts. But such a position will create two other difficulties. First, this will go against the Śruti-passage

"Niṣkalam niṣkriyam śāntam niravadyam nirañjanam"[25]

saying that this Ultimate Reality is impartite, i.e., not made up of parts. And, secondly, what is made up of parts is bound to disintegrate and get destroyed like our houses, clothes, and even our bodies. To meet such a challenge the Sūtrakāra hurls his last weapon on the opponent's head by saying that the Scriptures are his sheet-anchor. If they say 'day' it is day; 'night' it is night. "There's not to reason why, There's but to do and die."[26] The spiritual discipline is as strict as or perhaps stricter than the military discipline. I am again tempted to quote the following lines from Srī Aurobindo Ghosh :

**"I give this example to show how these things work; it is not in the calculated way the human reason wants to lay down, but by a more mysterious and greater law."[27]**

All this the Sūtrakara says in his famous Sūtra

"Śrutes tu Sabda-mūlatvāt"[28]

meaning "Our belief proceeds from what is laid down in scriptures; and the scriptures are our first and our last resort." Śrī-Śaṁkārācarya while commenting upon this Sūtra, first, very faithfully explains the Sūtrakāra's viewpoint as follows :

Brahman or the Ultimate Reality can be known through the Scriptures and Scriptures alone. The sense-organs together with the mind are of no help whatsoever in this matter. Hence the nature of the Ultimate Reality has to be ascertained with the help of the Scriptures alone. In doing so, if something goes against logic, logic has to be set aside. For, after all, logic is the product of the limited mind, whereas the Ultimate Reality transcends all limits. The Scriptures speak of Brahman

as having parts and having no parts. And we have to accept Brahman as being both, disregarding of course the logical inconsistency involved therein. To cite analogies from our own experience let us turn to miraculous gems, sacred formulas, wonderworking herbs, and similar other objects. At different times and at different places they exhibit efficacies which bring about results which are mutually incongruous. [ Such things, though extremely rare nowadays, were not so in the days of Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya, who himself was one of such wonder-workers. ] To know of such efficacies, of their invariable concomitants, and of the conditions under which they work, one has to approach an instructor. For, no amount of rational thinking will enable one to do so. Will it, then be possible to know about the Ultimate Reality, which lies beyond human speech and thought, without instruction and simply with the help of logical reasoning? That is why the repositories of ancient lores aver : "Where the objects lie beyond the ken of human intelligence, one should not resort to logical reasoning. For, the very meaning of 'lying beyond the ken of human intelligence' is that no amount of logical reasoning will enable one to know about such objects.' So, the Scriptures alone will enable one to ascertain correctly the nature of the Ultimate Reality. But immediately thereafter, he proceeds his own way and adds as follows :

By saying that in matters lying beyond the ken of human intelligence, the Scriptures are final, and as such what they say has to be accepted as it is regardless of the fact whether what they say is logically consistent or inconsistent, one can silence the opponent, no doubt. But that does not mean that the Scriptures are entitled to make even illogical and inconsistent statements like a mad man. If they did so, who would have held them in so high an esteem? So, some sensible way has to be found out to remove this logical inconsistency. And there does exist one such way. Thereby no injustice will be done either to the Scriptures or to the Logic. And that way

is as follows : An imiginary problem is no problem at all. There is no need seriously to mind the mental condition of a person who is afraid of a rope-snake (a rope believed to be a serpent in the dark). Nor is there any serious need to make strenous efforts to kill such a serpent. The same is the case with the problem under consideration. If the world is real and Brahman has really transformed itself into the form of this universe, then the problem under consideration arises. But in reality, there is no real transformation, and there is no real world. The world is merely an appearance like a rope-snake. For the Śruti-passage has declared Brahman or the Ultimate Reality not only to be one but that too without a second. And logically what is one is always one and never many. So what appears as many has no existence whatsoever. Moreover, the one without-a-second Brahman has not even real attributes. For the existence of real attributes would curtail the second-lessness of the substance. So the question whether Brahman has parts or is partless also does not arise. Hence the present problem is entirely baseless. This will make it absolutely clear that Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya attaches greater importance to logical consistency than to the literal meaning of all the passages of the Scriptures. He accepts the literal meaning of the passage,

"Sad eva, Somya, idam agre āsīd, ekam eva advitīyam"[29]

meaning 'Oh gentle lad, the Ultimate Reality alone, only one and that too without a second, existed in the beginning" and that of others having the same import, rejecting at the same time the literal meaning of all the remaining passages. It is in this way that he resolves the conflict of the various Sruti-passages. And in doing so, as has been shown above, he goes to the length of defying even the Sūtrakāra.

9. Next, we may see how Śrī-Rāmānujācārya, an equally great personality, resolves this problem. The close observation

of what has been discussed above reveals that the conflict can take two distinct forms : (1) That raised by the Sūtrakāra himself, namely, whether the whole of the Ultimate Reality has transformed itself into the form of the universe or only a part thereof has done so. This together with the consequent difficulties is one form of this conflict. And (2) whether the Ultimate Reality has or has no attributes. This is the second form of the conflict. The first form of the conflict has little scope in the Vedāntic System of Srī-Rāmanujācārya. In his System, it is not God that transforms himself into the form of the universe; rather it is God's body alone that undergoes such transformation. So even after transformation the substance of God remains intact. So it is the second form of the conflict that needs consideration in detail. There are certain Scriptural Passages which say that the Ultimate Reality has got attributes. There are others which say that it has got no attributes. If both the sets of passages are taken literally, the logical inconsistency is evident. For a thing cannot both have attributes and no attributes at the same time. A person cannot be both present and absent at the same time. To remove this logical inconsistency Śrī-Rāmānujācārya suggests a very intelligent way. He says that in the passages where the Ultimate Reality is said to have attributes, we have to understand divine attributes; and in the passages where it is said to have no attributes, we have to understand mundane ones. Thus what the Śruti wants to say is that the Ultimate Reality has divine attributes only and the mundane ones. And then there remains no logical difficulty. A person may be present physically and at the same time can be absent mentally. And let it be said incidentally that if the Sūtrakāra and Śrī-Vallabhācārya were asked to choose between the respective ways of Srī-Śaṁkarācārya and Śrī-Rāmānujācārya, they would certainly prefer that of the latter. For, in the former, with the exception of a few, practically all the scriptural passages are deprived of their literal meaning; whereas in the latter the literal sense of all the passages remains intact.

10. What has been stated in the few foregoing section will serve as an excellent introduction for grasping the somewhat unusual views of Śrī-Vallabhācārya in the matter. In order to grasp these views of Śrī-Vallabhācārya fully and clearly one ought always to keep befere one's mind his extreme regard for the Vedic Scriptures and his extreme faith in the omnipotence of the Almighty. For him even every letter of the Vedas is sacred. The meaning that is yielded by all these passages after taking all of them in their literal sense constitutes his Vedāntic Philosophy. If there appears any logical inconsistency in the doctrines arrived at in this way, his Almighty Lord is there with all his omnipotence to remove it in his most mysterious being. His dicta in this connection are :

"Acintyānanta-śaktimati sarvabhavana-samarthe
Brahmaṇi virodhābhāvac ca"[30]

and

"Sarvabhāva-samarthatvād acintyaiśvaryavaḍ Bṛhat."[31]

wherein it is stated that the Omnipotent Almighty can be anything whatsoever, even the repository of mutually inconsistent attributes. His powers are simply miraculous. They cannot be comprehended by means of our minds. For our minds are limited whereas his powers are unlimited. And, after all, what is Logic ? It is a construction of our limited minds. How can it limit the limitless ? Faith alone can grasp this limitless substance. Mathematics is the most exact of all sciences. Does its conception of Infinity rest on intellectual grasp ? Can this Infinity be reached ? Has it not been taken on trust then ? Not only Śrī-Vallabhācārya, but the Sūtrakāra also has rejected it in matters extra-mundane in his famous Sutra

"Śrutes tu Śabda-mūlatvāt"[32]

meaning that Śruti or Revelation is the sheet-anchor. Śrī-Vallabhācārya's respect for the Śruti has already been referred to. He cannot disrespect a single letter thereof. Not only this

he believes the Śruti to be perfect besides this. He does not only like to subtract anything from the Śruti, he cannot brook any addition to it also. This is the reason why he does not whole-heartedly subscribe to the view of Śrī-Rāmānujācārya. For the latter, when he says that in the Śruti-passages where the Ultimate Reality is spoken of as having attributes, we have to understand them as divine attributes, adds the word 'divine'. Śrī-Vallabhācārya does not brook this addition even; for such an addition means that the Śruti is lacking to that extent. According to him, if we at all want to trust the Scriptures, let us do so whole-heartedly. When a true devotee sets up an idol, he whole-heartedly believes it to be God in spite of its apparent limitations. The same should be our attitude towards the Scriptures. Idols and Scriptures may have limitations. But that does not mean that our Faith too should have limitations. And just as the absolute faith of a devotee draws the divinity out of the idol, in the same way the absolute faith in these Scriptures will draw the essential truth out of them. And such a belief is not merely an idle piece of imagination. It is a solid fact on the other hand. Svāmī Śrī-Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahaṁsa had demonstrated it in his own life; and Svāmī Vivekānanda had boldly proclaimed it to the whole world. And this too not in a distant past, but in the very century preceding the present one. If at all we want to trust, let us do so whole-heartedly. Half-measures never succeed. And it is with such absolute faith that Śrī-Vallabhācārya approaches the Scriptures. If this point is grasped clearly, it will not at all be difficult to either understand or appreciate his views.

11. Now, we can very well proceed to consider the way in which Śrī-Vallabhācārya has arrived at the very unusual view as regards the nature of the Ultimate Reality, technically known as Viruddhadharmāśraya-Vāda, the Doctrine of Mutually Conflicting Qualities residing in One and the Same Substance. And this way is as follows: While interpreting the Scriptures,

Śrī-Vallabhācārya wants to show equal respect to all the passages. To attach very great importance to some one passage and then to subordinate all the remaining ones to that is quite alien to his nature. And this is just what Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya does. And that is just why Śrī-Vallabhacārya unreservedly criticises the latter. But as for the latter's personality he has a very high regard. For this latter is, by him, believed to be an incarnation of Lord Śaṁkara, the last member of the Divine Trinity, Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya attaches the greatest importance to the Scriptural Passage :

> "Sad eva, Somya, idam agre āsīd, ekam
> evā advitīyam"[33]

meaning "Oh gentle lad, in the beginning there was the Ultimate Reality alone, only One and that too without a second." But he neglects the passage :

> "Tad aikṣata 'Bahu syām, prajāyeya' iti"[34]

meaning that Ultimate Reality wished to become Many, to multiply itself" which immediately follows this first passage. The other passages that follow them and describe how this One Ultimate Reality became Many share the same fate at his hand. Had he attached equal importance to all these latter passages, as has been done by Śrī-Vallabhācārya, no trouble would have arisen at all. The fact that that One without-a-second Ultimate Reality has also the inherent capacity of becoming Many at the same time would have immediately followed and the way would have been smooth throughout. Logic limits our thinking process only. It does not limit the inherent capacity of thing. Where there are a husband and a wife, Logic will prevent us from taking them to be three instead of two. But it does not say that they will always remain two and not become three by an addition to the family. But Śrī-Śaṁkarācāryas's excessive adherence to Logical consistency ties him up to this One without-a-second Ultimate Reality, with

the ultimate result that he not only has to disregard a major portion of Scriptural Passages but has also to declare this universe to have no reality at all. Thus it is his excessive adherence to logical consistency which has dragged him into the mire of Illusionism. Śrī-Vallabhācārya on the other hand, respecting all the passages concerned, endows his Ultimate Reality, which is only One and that too without a second, with the inherent capacity of becoming Many not in appearance only but in reaility. And thus, the world for him becomes a solid reality. He too believes in Māyā no doubt. For the Scriptural Passage :

"Indro māyābhiḥ puru-rūpa īyate"[35]

meaning that "God, who is one, appears to have many forms because of many Māyās", expressly speak not of only one Māyā, but of many Māyās. But this Māyā of Śrī-Vallabhācārya is not one which covers reality and sets up an unreality in its place. It is, according to him, the inherent capacity of that One Ultimate Reality, whereby it becomes Many in reality. Thus, according to him the world with all its diversity is as much real as the Ultimate Reality which is One and without a second. Thus. according to him, there is no difference between the present world and the past Ultimate Reality. The gold of the ingot and that of the ornament are one and the same. All the forms into which the gold can be cast are as much real as the gold. All these forms are already present in the gold. They inhere it. Had they not been there, it would lead us to a doctrine of the creation ex nihilo, i.e., creating something out of nothing. But the Upaniṣadic dictum :

"Katham asataḥ sat jāyeta"[36]

meaning "How can anything come out of nothing?" directly repudiates it. So, according to Śrī-Vallabhācārya, the present universe was already there in the Ultimate Reality. It is not something new. Thus, just as his respect for all the Scriptural Passages has enabled him to arrive at this bold Realism, in the same way this very respect of his all the Scriptual Passages

enables him to arrive at his extra-ordinary doctrine of Viruddha-dharmāśraya, in other words, the doctrine of the Mutually Conflicting Qualities residing side by side in One and the same substance. As cited above one Scriptural Passage speaks of Brahman as devoid of all smells and all tastes, whereas another speaks of it as having all smells and all tastes. According to the Second Law of Thought, technically known as the law of Contradiction, this is not possible. We cannot mentally conceive any such thing. But by equally respecting these two passages, i.e. taking them to be literally true, Śrī-Vallabhācārya both boldly believes and even declares that Brahman is both having and not having these qualities. Why? Because the Śruti says so. If we fail to grasp this intellectually, it is rather the fault of our intellect. To set limitations to the incomprehensibly miraculous power of the Ultimate Reality simply because our intellectual powers are limited, will never bring about liberation, the ultimate goal of all the philosophical systems. To learn to swim requires to leave the firm ground below our feet, and to take a head-long plunge. The same is true of liberation. We have to leave the logical certainty. And it is just here that the Faith is needed. Faith can comprehend anything and everything. Its powers are sweeping. Its range is limitless. Faith is needed even in Mathematics, the most exact of all sciences. Will our imagination ever find out the point where the two parallel straight lines meet? Will our intellect ever find the quotient when a number is divided by zero? Why does Mathematics, the most rational and exacting of all Scienees, believe in the point at infinity in one case, and infinity itself in the other? Can this infinity be demonstrated? Nevertheless, the Mathematics has to believe in it. This is nothing but Faith. At best we can call this an Intelligent Faith. It is resorted to only when we realise the limitations of our intellect. Mahātmā Gāndhī means the same thing when he writes "My life is largely governed by reason, and when it fails, it is governed by a superior force, that is faith."[37]

Śrī-Vallabhācārya's Faith also is an Intelligent Faith and not a Blind Faith. He believes in human efforts, both physical and mental. His famous dictum :

"Prayatna-paryantam Jīva-kṛtyam"[38]

meaning "One has to try one's utmost" categorically lays this down. "Where human efforts end, there divine efforts begin." This is a very important truth. Human efforts are a vital link in the chain. Without them the chain will sap asunder. It is only after all the human energy has been spent that the divine energy will begin to flow in. When a seed has once been sown by human hands, then alone all the natural forces necessary to multiply it are set free. Without the seed being sown, all these latent forces are helpless. The human efforts alone will open the doors for the divine efforts to come in. Faith in the divine is the continuation of the faith in the human. God helps the helpless. But this helplessness is of a sterner stuff. It arises after all the available help in the form of all possible human efforts is totally expended. Idle faith is no faith according to Śrī-Vallabhācārya. It is another form of mental inertia. It hinders rather than helps. Sevā or selfless service is his ideal of life. This Sevā means incessant activity. It is traditionally reported that Śrī-Vallabhācārya slept only for two hours. And at times he had to deny even this little luxury to himself. "I have done my little duty with my limited strength. Now God out of his infinite Grace is sure to do his duty with his unlimited strength." Such is the nature of Śrī-Vallabhācārya's Faith. And it is this faith that has led him to respect every letter of the Vedas and to believe in the Omnipotence and the Infinite Grace of God. Of course; this Faith of his was instinctive as all genuine Faiths are. Faith is the very substance of a soul, according to the Bhagavadgītā. It says :

"Śraddhāmayo'yam puruṣaḥ"[39]

meaning "The soul is made up of faith". Faith is just reliance on something. It is something like seeking a well. You have to select a spot and start digging just there, and go on doing so till the water is reached. Changing spots from time to time will result in sheer waste of time and energy. No water will ever be reached. The same is the case with the realisation of God. He is like water. Just as many layers of earth intervene between the seeker of the well and the water, in the same way many factors intervene between the aspirant and God. He has to base his faith somewhere and has to stick to it till he finds God. Now, if Śrī-Vallabhācārya had to base his faith somewhere, where else was he to base it except on the Scriptures which, though interpreted differently, were equally respected by all his noble contemporaries as well as predecessors? And when once it was based, it had to be thorough. This is the only thing that can be said in justification of Śrī-Vallabhācārya's faith in Scriptures. His great predecessors, Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya and Sri-Rāmānujācārya had the same faith in Scriptures. The difference lay only in their attitudes, which were due to the different times in which they flourished. The times of Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya were those of Buddhist dialecticians. Had he talked like Śrī-Vallabhācārya, nobody would have heard him. Śrī Rāmānujācārya was better-placed in this respect. His atmosphere was sanctified by the Votaries of the Veda and the Ālvārs. Coming to the point, we can see how Śrī-Vallabhā-cārya's unalloyed Faith in the Scriptures has enabled him to stem the tide of logical inconsistency involved in believing that Brahman or the Ultimate Reality has both attributes and no attributes and in how One can become many. Now what remains to be done is to find some rational justification for this peculiar attitude which openly flouts logic and believes what is ordinarily unbelievable. And in this connection, I can do nothing better than quote the following lines by J.B.S. Haldane, an eminent British scientist :

"Life, then, seems to be a synthesis of two opposites, mechanism and individuality. A man is a machine, and at the

same time an individual. There is nothing really surprising in this. We find **the same union of opposites everywhere. Wood is both hard and soft. It it were not hard, we could not use it for furniture. If it were not soft, we could not cut it. ...**

"We see then that **life is an extra-ordinary bundle OF CONTRADICTIONS. It is something between mechanism and individuality, between chance and purpose, between happy but stagnant perfection, and struggling but evolving imperfection. ... It is a constant struggle against death, yet without death it could not progress.**

**"The philosopher tries to define it, but no definition will cover its infinite and self-contradictory variety. The biologist studies it, well aware that he can never hope to fathom its complexity."[40]**

Scientists, like J. B. S. Haldane, have through keen observation and strictly scientific methods, come to such conclusions. In what way do these conclusions differ from those to which Śrī-Vallabhācārya has arrived at through instinctive faith in the Scriptures and through a uniform respect for all the passages thereof?

12. Now we may take up the fourth aspect. According to this aspect the Ultimate Reality is endowed with all divine qualities. In other words, it is not attribute-less as some other philosophers are disposed to think. In foregoing sections it has been repeatedly told that with our limited mental apparatus it is not possible for us to fathom mysteries surrounding the nature of the Ultimate Reality. For that we have to turn to the words of those who had been face to face with God, the Ultimate Reality, through his Grace. And our Scriptures are such words. They say :

"Sad eva, Somya, idam agre āsīd, ekam eva advitīyam"[41]

meaning "Oh gentle lad, in the beginning there existed the Ultimate Reality alone, only one without a second." Here it would have been quite sufficient to say that there was in the beginning this Ultimate Reality alone. Then why the words "ekam eva advitīyam" meaning "only one and that too without a second ?" The Scriptures being divine are perfectly immaculate. They would not repeat anything unnecessarily. So these additional words have got some additional significance. And that significance appears to be this : The substance is fundamental. Without that our thought does not proceed at all. Now, when we begin to think about a substance its attributes begin to attract our attention. They are different from the substance. For the substance is one, whereas these attributes are many. Moreover the substance is a whole, whereas these attributes are parts. And thus being different they become seeond to it. So when the Śruti says that the Ultimate Reality was One without a second, by the word "second" they mean "an attribute." So the Passage under consideration wants to state that the Ultimate Reality has in the beginning not even attributes. And it was only when this Ultimate Reality became many and multiplied itself that these attributes came into being. And, according to Śrī-Vallabhācārya, there was in the days of the Sūtrakāra, a school of Vedic Exponents who did hold such a view. Incidentally, we may mention here that Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya being an absolute monist, believes that the Ultimate Reality has no attributes whatsoever. If they appear, they are illusory. Coming to the point, according to Śrī-Vallabhācārya, Brahman, because of its miraculous nature, is both with and without attributes; and these attributes are both different and non-different from the substance. This he has tried to explain rationally while explaining the Sūtra.

"Prakāśāśraya-vad, vā, tejastvāt"[42]

which tries to explain the nature of attributes on the analogy of the light of the Sun. There he says that the light of the Sun is an attribute of the Sun which is the substance. This

light is different from the Sun. We say that the Sun rises and the Sun sets. We never say that the light rises and the light sets. Moveover, the light is here, whereas the Sun is far, far away. These two, the Sun and its light, though different are not as the tree and the monkey which is on it or as the cage and the bird which is in it. These latter can remain without each other; but not so the Sun and its light. Something more. This light itself appears as a substance when we say that the light is intense and the light is dim. Here intensity and dimness become the attributes of light thus making it to be a substance. Thus the light of the Sun is not only an attribute but is also a substance. Now, after this much of close observation, a very material question arises : Should perception decide the nature of our conception ? Or should conception decide the nature of our perception ? Which course are we to adopt ? Which course will enrich our knowledge and liberate our thought ? Like all sane people Srī-Vallabhācārya says that our perception should decide our conception and not vice versa. We have to accept the things as they are and as they unmistakably present themselves to our healthy senses. Why should we shackle ourselves with our pre-conceptions ? If we want to do so, let us bid good-bye to our ideas about progress, evolution, and liberation, Coming to the point according to Śrī-Vallabhācarya, the Ultimate Reality has not only attributes but these attributes on the analogy of the light of the Sun, are both different and non-different from it. Moreover they are real and not illusory. As we are concerned here with only the general nature of the attributes of the Ultimate Reality, we need not concern ourselves with what they are and how many.

13. Now, we may turn to the fifth aspect. According to this aspect, the Ultimate Reality is both personal as well as impersonal and the personal aspect thereof repeatedly incarnates itself. Before considering this aspect at some length, it will be well if our notions about "personal" and "impersonal" are cleared up.

To do so, take a simple instance of a king and his laws. The king is a person, but his laws are not. In order to grasp well the difference between what is personal and what is impersonal, the consideration of the following instance from the life of Abraham Lincoln will help us a lot. During the Civil War, when he was the President, a soldier fell asleep during watch, was caught red-handed, and according to the strict military rules, was condemned to death. But before his execution, the matter came before Lincoln, who having equired into the circumstances pardoned him. The circumstances were as follows : For the last twenty-four hours he had to march continuously, so he had no sleep. The person whose turn it was to be on the watch happened to be sick. The condemned soldier took pity on him, stood on the watch in his stead, and sent him away to take rest. Having had no sleep during the last twenty-four hours, and having had to march continuously during that period, he was completely exhausted, and so fell asleep. According to the strict military rules this was a serious fault; and execution was the only punishment for such a serious default. And, but for Lincoln's intervention, this defaulter would have met his death. The impersonal laws condemned him. Lincoln a person pardoned him. The impresonal laws were mighty. All the others except the President were quite helpless before them. Thus these laws though mighty had no mind and no eonsequent discrimination, which Lincoln, a person, had. They punished the act without entering into the exonerating circumstances. Physical laws governing the universe are as impersonal as the military rules. Fire burns all alike whether they are adults having knowledge or infants having no knowledge. That such mighty laws ruthlessly govern the universe cannot be denied. Now, we may seriously ask a question : Is the Ultimate Reality impersonal like military laws or personal like Lincoln, the President ? It it is impersonal like the military laws, the prayers, the sacrifices, and all such devotional practices that have existed from times immemorial become altogether meaningless. And it is not mere foolish blind faith

that have sustaind them throughtout. The efficacy of such practices has been proverbial.

"More things are wrought by prayer."[43]

So says saintly Tennyson.

"Suneri maine nirbalaka bala Rāma :

Pichalı sākha bharūm santanakı, āḍe
Saṁbhāre kāma."[44]

So declares the great poet-devotee Sūradāsa. He here states that God helps the helpless and adds that he can cite a number of instances where God has helped persons in dire needs. "Pray and your prayer will be granted" is the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. Why go to the distant past? Mahātmā Gāndhı was the living example of such faith. The combination of the physical laws before which men are helpless and this efficacy of prayers yields us an Ultimate Reality which is both impersonal and personal. Now, the existence of the impersonal laws in the universe is accepted by all, whether they believe or do not believe in God. For such, the knowledge of these laws and their non-violation are the only means to escape punishment. But for the believers in God, God's grace is an additional means to do so. Śrı-Vallabhācārya and, according to him, the Sūtrakāra also both believe in the Personal God. In the Sūtra :

"Īkṣater nāśabdam"[45]

The Sūtrakāra says that the Ultimate Reality has a desire. Again in the Sūtra :

"Racanānupatteśca nānumānam"[46]

he says that the Ultimate Reality is not devoid of conciousness because there is so much of law, order, and design in the nniverse.

As for the Śruti, it clearly declares the Ultimate Reality to be personal in a number of passages, out of which I cite only two as follows :

"Tad aikṣata, 'Bahu syām, prajāyey'iti"[47]

meaning "The Ultimate Reality wished : Let myself be many, let me multiply myself."

"Yam eva eṣa vṛṇute tena labhyaḥ"[48]

meaning "He alone whom God choose can find God." As for the Bhagavadgītā, its Principal Actor, the very preacher, is Personal God himself. The citation of the two passages where his Gracious nature is quite visible will suffice. They are as follows :

"Sarva-dharmān parityajya
Mām ekam Śaraṇam Vraja :
Aham tvā sarva-pāpebhyo
Mokṣayiṣyāmi ma śucaḥ."[49]

meaning "Leave all talk of religious duties. Surrender yourself to Me. I shall relieve you from all sins."

"Yadā yadā hi dharmasya
Glānir bhavati, Bhārata;
Abhyuttānam adharmasya
Tadātmānam sṛjāmyaham.
Paritrāṇāya sādhūnām,
Vināśaya ca duṣkṛtām;
Dharmasaṁsthāpanāthāya
Saṁbhavami yuge yuge."[50]

meaning "Whenever justice is in peril and injustice becomes prevalent I incarnate myself to protect the virtuous and to destroy the wicked. For the sake of restoring justice I incarnate myself from time." This last passage clearly mentions the repeated incarnation of the Personal God.

14. Now, we may take up the sixth, and as far as the chapter is concerned, the last aspect. According to this aspect, all the activity involed in creating this universe and sustaining it is for this Ultimate Reality a mere sport. The Scriptures in unmistakable terms declare that God, i. e., the Ultimate Reality, has created this universe, Now the act of creation is an activity on the part of God. But, generally any activity has these two essential features : (I) It is to meet some want, to fulfil some desire that an activity is undertaken. (2) Every activity involves some hardship. A person having no water in his house goes to a well. He wants water. And it is to meet this want that he takes the trouble of going to the well, Turning to God we may legitimately ask : To meet which want of his, does God create the universe ? Secondly, if even an ordinary activity entails some trouble, what a tremndous amount of trouble would God have had to undergo in creating so vast and so complex a universe? The first question arises because God being perfect can have no want; and the second because the trouble entailed by the activity would curtail the amount of his joy. To both these questions, the Sūtrakāra and following him Śrī-Vallabhācārya has but one answer : namely.

"Lokavat tu līlā-Kaivalyam"[51]

meaning "It is merely a sport on the part of God, like any other sport to be met with in this world," A sport is something spontaneous, a direct result of overflowing joy. A baby smiles. Why dose it do so ? To meet which want does it do so ? A baby's smile is the outward result of the inward overflowing joy. The same is true of God, God is all-joy, all overflowing joy. And this creation is the outward expression of the inward oveflowing joy. And when an activity results from the overflowing joy, the trouble involed is no truble at all because it is not felt as such, It is in this way that the act of creation becomes merel a matter of sport on the part of the Ultimate Reality.

15. Thus in the two chapters we have seen that the Ultimate Reality is not only One without a second, but moreover it has an inherent capacity of becoming Many in all its rich and infinite variety, that it has actually become Many out of its overflowing joy, that all this has taken place automatically and without the least inconvenience to the actor, that this Ultimate Reality has all the divine attributes which are non-different from its substance, and above all it is endowed with an incomprehensibly great and mysterious power whereby it can become anything and it can achieve anything automatically. Now, what remains to be done is to view it in its relation to the two other sub-categories, the animate souls and the inanimate objects, the two basic components of this universe of our experince.

---

## CHAPTER V
## TWO SUB-CATEGORIES

1. Not let us consider the two sub-categories, namely, the animate souls and the inanimate objects. What has gone before may have some mediate concern no doubt. But these two have immediate concern for us. For one of them we actually are in our present state and the other constitutes the setting in which we find ourselves. Of these two again, the first, i.e., the animate souls have direct importance. For they are active participants in this World-Play. The importance of the other lies in so far as it contributes to the happiness or otherwise of the first. As our aim in this Thesis is simply to deal with only the general aspects of any problem, we do not go into details and touch only the salient points. Now, whatever be the Ultimate Nature of these two categories, it is a patent fact that the majority of those that belong to the first do not feel fully satisfied in the setting in which they find themselves. They have a dim vision of, and an unconscious instinctive drive in, some definite direction. This is happiness. But what constitutes their happiness they do not know. And this definite ignorance of theirs together with the indefinite urge is at the root of all the worldly activities, whether economical, social, political, or spiritual. These souls try their level best to secure the happiness, of which they have only a dim vision. Most of them fail to do so. And even those who either wholly or partly succeed are again not as happy as they expect to be. For they want more. The poet Shelley's lines :

> "We think before and after
> And pine for what is not"[1]

very beautifully describe this condition. After this much general consideration, we may now turn to the consideration

of what our System of Suddhādvaita Vedānta can contribute in this direction. Let it be made clear at the outset that it, being a spiritual activity, will directly contribute to mental peace only. Next, we have to consider how it will help us in adjusting ourselves to the setting in which we find ourselves.

2. Coming to the point, the souls referred to above are either of active or contemplative. And we find that the majority there of are active, the minority alone being contemplative. These latter will concentrate on the one thought that the Ultimate Reality has become these animate souls as well as the inanimate objects. In the beginning this will be a mere idea only. But by constant concentration on this one idea, that idea will gathar strength and the sight of everything will in course of time evoke this one idea in his mind, which in its turn will give rise to ineffable mental peace and even joy. That such a person will radiate peace and joy all around, we can easily suppose. But being contemplative he will generally do nothing more. Coming to the active type, we can say that behind all his activities there will be this one idea animating them all. He will, in course of time, come instinctively to feel that God or the Ultimate Reality is a Master Organism whereof the various souls are different organs. The nature of this feeling will be made clear by the following illustration : Our body is a big organism. Our hands and feet are its various organs. If a mosquito sits on our foot, our hand instinctively reaches it and drives it away. Our hands and feet are evidently different. Nevertheless, one instinctively runs to the succour of the other. Why? Because some one and the same entity animates both of them. The same will be the case with an ardent active follower of this system. To the best of his ability, he will, in the first place, do no harm to anything whether animate or inanimate, and in the second place, will run to the succour of others without any distinction of caste or creed. The lives of Śrī-Vallabhācārya and Śrī-Viṭṭhaleśa were ideal in this respect. The former

was more contemplative, the latter more active. And this latter is reported to have offerred to a dying untouchable woman the water that was meant to be offerred to his Deity, As for their attitude towards inanimate objects, they will be worshippers of beauty and grace everywhere. The ideal person, according to both Śrı-Vallabhācārya and Śrı-Viṭṭhaleśa, is one who hurts nothing either animate or inanimate, and tries to the best of his ability, to please the animate souls and to beautify the inanimate objects. It is in this way that he realise his ideal according to the System of Śuddhādvaita Vedānta. Is this ideal not a universal one in its application? And dose the System of Śuddhādvaita Vedānta not supply a rational basis for Ideal? This is what I have humbly to place before the general intelligent public to the best of my ability. But this ability is not mine. It is the liberal gift of the Almighty All-gracious Ultimate Reality.

---

## CHAPTER VI

## RECAPITULATION

1. We started by stating that there is nothing bad or dogmatic in Real Religion. If it was brought into disrepute, it was so because of the blind fanaticism of its followers. To condemn Religion, because some of its followers in their false zeal combined with ignorance happen to have prepetrated the most heinous crimes against humanity in Religion's name, is equally unwise. Remove this wrong element and have Religion it its pure form. It is a veritable jewel, a veritable nectar. It is a factor common to all religions. That is why Mahātmā Gandhi has said :

"Though religions are many, Religion is one"[1]

And this Religion, which respects all religions and all men, and which hurts nobody's feelings, well not only be fully democratic but also completely universal.

2. This ideal Oneness of Religion is not merely a piece of idle pious imagination. It has sound scientific basis. Complexity confounds us. That is why we hanker after simplicity, And this simplicity is at the root of things, It is from this simplicity that the rich complexity has come into being. Scientists have found it in their heads. Saints have found it in their hearts. God, or the Ultimate Reality is nothig else but this all comprehensive Master simplicity Śuddhādvaita is but another word for this Master Simplicity.

3. According to the System of Śuddhādvaita Vedānta, this Master Simplicity itself has transformed itself into this vast Complexity without losing nothing of its substance. Gold does

not cease to be gold by becoming an ornament. There is nothing simpler than Unity. Therefore Master Simplicity is Unity. It is this Unity that will satisfy our craving for simplicity. It this Unity that will make absolute freedom from fear possible. The ideas of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence point in the direction of the Unity, Revelation and Reason both justify this Unity, And this Unity is no more idle talk. We had amongst us in the past and have even in the present saintly persons who are embodiments of this Unity in thought, word and deed. And it is by following in their foot-steps that we shall have Universal Peace. Saluting them all I conclude this little brochure of mine. May peace pervade everywhere.

# APPENDIX I

## PERSONS AND AUTHORS :

(N.B. Most of them are world - renowned)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Aurobindo Ghosh | ... A great seer of our own time |
| 2. | Bādarāyaṇa | ... The reputed author of the Brahmasūtras, at times referred to as "Sūtrakāra." |
| 3. | Baird | ... Dr. Baird, the Inventor of Television |
| 4. | Besant | ... Dr. Annie Besant, the Great Theosophist |
| 5. | Bose | ... Sir Jagdish Chandra Bose |
| 6. | Clarke | ... A.C. Clarke, a famous British Scientist |
| 7. | Einstein | ... Albert Einstein |
| 8. | Gāndhī | ... Mahātmā Gāndhī |
| 9. | Haldane | ... J.B.S. Haldane, a famous British Scientist |
| 10. | Huxley | ... Aldous Huxley, a famous British Author. |
| 11. | Lincoln | ... Abraham Lincoln |
| 12. | Madhva | ... Śrī–Madhvācārya |
| 13. | Radhakrishnan | ... Dr. S. Radhakrishnan |
| 14. | Rāmakṛṣṇa Paramahaṁsa | ... An ambodiment of God realization |
| 15. | Rāma Tīrtha | ... Svāmī Rāma Tīrtha |

16. Rāmanuja .. Śrī-Ramānujācārya

17. Roosevelt .. President Roosevelt

18. Śaṁkara ... Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya

19. Shelley .. P. B. Shelley, a famous English Poet

20. Sūradāsa .. A famous Indian Poet-Saint

21. Sūtrakāra .. Vide No. 2 above.

22. Tennyson .. Alfred Tennyson, the Poet Laureate

23. Vallabha ... Śrī-Vallabhācārya

24. Vivekānanda .. Svāmī Vivekānanda

25. Viṭṭhaleśa .. Son of Śrī-Vallabhācārya, a worthy son of a worthy father.

---

## APPENDIX II

### ABBREVIATIONS AND BOOKS :

A.B.A. ... Annie Besant : Autobiography - Adyar, 1939

A.B.T. ,, : Theosophy - People's Book Series

A.G.H.M. ... Aurobino ( Ghosh ) on Himself and on Mother-Pondicherry, 1953

A.P. ... Antaḥkaraṇa - Prabodha - A minor work of Śrī-Vallabhācārya

B.G. ... Bhagavad-Gītā

BH.SU. ... Bhāgavata-Subodhinī-Śrī-Vallabhācārya's masterly Commentary on Bhāgavata

B.S. ... Brahma-Sūtras

B.S.A.B. ... Brahma-Sūtra-Aṇubhāṣya-Śrī-Vallabhācārya's Commentary on B.S.

B.S.M.B. ... Brahma-Sūtra-Madhvabhāṣya

B.S.S.B. ... Brahma-Sūtra-Śaṁkarabhāṣya

B.U. ... Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad

C.U. ... Chāndogyopaniṣad

D.S. ... Daśa-Ślokī - A minor work of Śrī-Śaṁkarācārya

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| G.M. | ... | Gajendra - Mokṣa - A Chapter from Mahābhārata |
| I.U. | ... | Īśāvāsyopaniṣad |
| K.U. | ... | Kaṭhopaniṣad |
| KN.U. | ... | Kenopaniṣad |
| M.U. | ... | Muṇḍakopaniṣad |
| P.S.A.G. | ... | M.A. Pandit's "Sadhana in Aurobindo Ghosh" —Pondicherry 1964. |
| P.S.R. | ... | Picked up from Stray Reading and the source where of it was very difficult to find out. |
| R.R.L.V. | ... | Romain Rolland's "The Life of Vivekananda" English Translation, 1965 |
| R.S.H.P. | ... | A. K. Roger's "Student's History of Philosophy" - New York, 1928. |
| ṚV | ... | Ṛgveda |
| S.L.L. | ... | D. C. Sharma's "Learn and Live" - Oxford, 1949 |
| S.R. | ... | Siddhānta-Rahasya - A minor work of Śrī-Vallabhācārya |
| S.U. | ... | Śvetāśvataropaniṣad |
| T.D.N.I. | ... | *Tattvārthadīpa-Nibandha Chapter I Bombay Eddition |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| T.D.N. III | ... | *Tattvārthadīpa - Nibandha Chapter III Surat Eddition<br>*A Philosophical Digest by Śrī-Vallabhācāraya. |
| T.U. | ... | Taittirīyopaniṣad |
| V.DH. | ... | Vivekadhairyāśraya - A minor work of Śrī-Vallabhācarya |
| W.I.L. | ... | Welton's "Intermediate Logic" - London, 1938. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Bhāgavata ... | One of the eighteen Purāṇas, treated by Śrī-Vallabhācārya as the Fourth Prasthāna along with the other three, the Vedas, the Bhagavadgītā, and the Brahmasūtras. |
| Bible ... | The Holy Bibble |
| Mahābhārata ... | The first great Indian Epic. |
| Ramakrishna & His Disciples ... | A Biographical Work by Christopher Isherwood. |
| Rāmāyaṇa ... | The second great Indian Epic. |

---

# APPENDIX III

## SOURCES OF QUOTATIONS :

### Preface

1. P.S.R.

### Chapter I

1. P.S.R.
2. P.S.R.
3. R.R.L.V. P. 266
4. BH.SU. I Introductory Stanzas, 5
5. S.R. 1
6. A.P. 5–6

### Chapter II

1. A.B.A. PP. 238–239
2. A.B.A. PP. 240–241
3. B.S. 2.1.11
4. A.B.A. PP. 438–446
5. A.G.H.M. PP. 128–130
6. S.U. 6.23
7. K.U. 2.8
8. C.U. 6.14.2
9. C.U. 6.14
10. B.S. 2.1.27
11. B.S.A.B. 1.1.2
12. B.S.A.B. 1.1.2
13. B.S.A.B. 1.1.2
14. T.D.N. I.7–8
15. ṚV. 1.164.46
16. G.M. 146
17. B.G. 9.23
18. P.S.R.
19. V.DH. 17
20. Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade"
21. II. 5
22. B.S.A.B. 1.1.2
23. T.D.N. III I.I2
24. T.D.N. I. 8
25. S.R. 2
26. B.S.A.B. 1.2.28
27. M.U. 3.1.8
28. K.U. 2.4.1
29. II. 5

## Chapter III

1. C.U. 6.2.1.
2. C.U. 6.2.3
3. P.S.R.
4. P.S.R.
5. P.S.R.
6. P.S.R.
7. RV. 3.62.10
8. T.D.N. III. 5.1
9. Luke XVII.21 (The Bible)
10. K.U. 2.4.1
11. C.U. 6.2.1–2
12. S.U. 1.1
13. C.U. 6.1.3
14. M.U. 2.2.8
15. B.G. 6.22
16. P.S.R.
17. P.S.R.
18. C.U. 6.2.1
19. B.S.A.B. 1.1.2
20. B.S.S.B. 1.1.2
21. B.S.A.B. 1.1.2
22. B.S.M.B. 2.1.14
23. KN.U. 3
24. B.S. 1.1.3 (or 4)
25. T.U. 2.7.
26. B.G. 16. 1–3
27. B.U. 4.2.4
28. B.U. 4.4.25
29. B.U. 1.4.2
30. B.G. 9.29
31. T.D.N. I.76
32. P.S.R.

## Chapter IV

1. T.D.N. I.65–72
2. R.S.H.P. PP. 1–3
3. T.D.N. I.70
4. A.B.T. P. 17
5. B.U. Śānti–Pātha
6. P.S.A.G. P. 9
7. P.S.A.G. PP. 12–14
8. T.U. 2.4
9. B.G. 7.19
10. P.S.R.
11. S.L.L. P. 58
12. M.U. 3.1.8
13. K.U. 2.4.1
14. M.U. 3.1.8
15. K.U. 1.2.15
16. T.U. 2.4.9
17. K.U. 4.11
18. K.U. 3.15
19. C.U. 3.14.2
20. K.U. 2.20

21. I,U. 5
22. W.I.L. PP. 13–15
23. C.U. 6.2.1.
24. D.S. 10
25. S.U. 6.19
26. II. 20
27. II. 5
28. B,S. 2.1.27
29. C.U. 6.2.1
30. B.S.A.B. 1.1.1.
31. B.S.A.B. 1.1.2
32. B.S. 2.7.27
33. C.U. 6.2.1
34. C.U. 6.2.3
35. B.U. 2.5.19
36. C.U. 6.2.1
37. P.S.R.
38. B.S.A.B. 2.3.42
39. B.G. 17.3
40. S.L.L. PP. 50–60
41. C.U. 6.2.1
42. B.S. 3.2.28
43. Tennyson's "The Passing of Arthur"
44. P.S.R.
45. B.S. 1.1.4 (or 5)
46. B.S. 2.2.1
47. C.U. 6.2.3
48. K.U. 2.23
49. B.G. 18.66
50. B.G. 4.7–8
51. B.S. 2.1.33

## Chapter V

1. Shelley's "To a Sky-lark"

## Chapter VI

1. P.S.R.

## SUBJECT INDEX

A

A. C. Clarke 4, 103
A. N. Jani J
A. P. Sinneth S
Abhaya (Fearlessness) 54, 61, F
Abraham Lincoln L
Absolute fearlessness 55
Āćāryas 6
Vedantaćārya V
Vaiśnavāćārya V
Śankarāćārya S
Ramanujaćārya R
Madhvaćarya —
Nimbarkāćarya N
Vallabhāćārya V
Actor 97
Adage 44
Age golden 41
Agnosticism 65
Agni 52
Ahmedabad 39
Albert Einstein E
Aldous Huxley H
Almighty 52, 83, 100
Altar of revelation 17
Ālvārs 89
Annie Besant B
Annihilation 21
Aṇubhāṣya 32, 53
Aphorism "Bādarāyan"
Apocryphal 31
Aristotle 76
Aspirant 22, 29, 89
Astronomy 19
Atheism 9, 13
Atheistic platform 13
Atma 38, 42
Attitudes 15, 19, 65
Attributes 97
Attribute-less 89, 90, 91, 92
Aurobindo Ghosh 9, 15, 30, 33, 69, 79, 103
Authority 8

B

Badā Mandir 7
Bādarāyaṇa Vyas V
- Aphorism 18
- Samadi Bhaṣa S
- Sutrakar V
Baroda 5
Beasts 51
-biped 25
Behavior 72
religious 24
Belief 4, 72
Orthodox 18, 19, 29, 32, 75
Spiritual 11

Believers-orthodox 31
Besant Annie (Dr.) 9, 12, 13, 103, A
Bhagvadgita (Śrimad) 18, 43, 54, 58, 88, 95, G
Bhāgvata (Śrimad) 18, 19, 31
Commentry on-6
Bhatta G. H. 5, G
Bhed
Sajātiya S
Svagat S
Vijatiya V
Bible 19, 22, 40
Bigotry 17
Biology 73
Biologist 80
Blavatsky H. V. H
Bliss 63, 70, 71
State of 41, S
Blood 74
Body 4, 5, 14, 37
God's 82
Bombay 7
Books of revelation 20
Bose J. C. (sir) 46
Bradlaugh Charles C
Brahman 67, 71, 79, 80, 81
Material cause 53
Ultimate reality 77, 78
(its) miraculous nature 91
Brahma Sūtra 6, 53
Brahmasūtra Bhaśya
Aṇubhāṣya A
Śarirak S
Brahmavād 8
Brahmins 39
Brain 9, 14, 74
Buddha Gautam 22, 25, 29
C
Capacity
inherent 50
of becoming many 86
Caste 31, 99
Catholic 6
Cause
efficient 58, 63
material 53, 63
instrumental 53
Cells 74
Century 6
Chāndogyopaniśad 16, 42, U
Character
omnipotent 61
Charls Bradlaugh 9, 12, 13, B
Chargeless 64
Christ Jesus 23, 25, J
-incarnation of God 22
Christians 17, 19, 22, 72
-corollary 23
-era e
Christianity 22, 94
Christopher
Isherwood 6
Civil-war 93
Comprehensive principle 65
Communities 31
Components basic 97
Conception 92
Confidance 15
Conflict 30
of śruti passages 81
among religion 21

Conflicting qualities 62
repository of 64
mutual 86
Consciousness 14, 34, 70, 78
98
Constitution of matter 10
Contemplation 100
Contradiction 76, 90
Contribution of religions 25
Conviction 39
Core 72
Creation 50
-time of 34
Her 68
Creator 51
Creature 74
Creed 99
Crimes 101
Cruelty 56, 58, 59
Culture 1
Customer 26
Curiosity 55

D

Death 90
Deity 13
Demons 45
Denizens 58
Devotte 5, 31
Dialecticians 89
Dictum-upniśadic 16, 68, 83
Different and non different 92
Differences 45
Dimness 92
Dikśitajl (sri) Mahāraj 6
Discipline 30, 79
Discord 73
Disease 21
Dislikes 71
Dissolution 34
Distinguished 66
Diversions 38
Diverse - names and forms 62
Divine 15
Divine - Mother 69
Divinity 84
Doctrine-
metaphysical 35, 54
śuddhādvait 3
(Pure-Monism) M
Vedantic 35-36, 77
Viruadhadharmā-śraya 86
Dross 31
Dogmas religious 3
Doubt 24, 27
Doubter 43
Dualism 65

E

Earth 10, 69
Effect doctrine 59
Efficacies 80
Efficient cause 58
Efforts human and divine 88
Electricity 73
Electrons 73
Elements [of chemistry] 51, 73
Emotions 9, 50
Energy 11
Divine 88
Forms of 73
Haman 88
Entity 25, 44, 51
Equality 17

Era christian 6
Ethical 65
Evil 56, 57, 58, 59, 60
Evolution 41
Experience of
Ultimate Reality 15, 28, U
Expression 96

F

Facilities 21
Faith 27, 28, 46, 89
Blind 87
Child like 76
Human Energy 88
In idol 28
In God 16
In Guru 16
Instinctive 90
Intelligent 87, 88
Necessity of 45
Falsehood 69
Famines 21
Fanatics 4, 31
Religious 3
Scientific 3
Fearlessness absolute 55
Feelings 65
Fire 25
Followers Buddha's 2
Forms divers d
Freedom absolute 61, 102

G

G. H. Bhatta 5, B
Gandhi (M. K.) Mahatma M
Gautam Buddha B
Gāyatri Mantra 39
Ghosh Aurobindo 103, A
God 6, 28, 30, 38, 40, 54, 59, 61, 88, 89, 96
Definition 42
Of actual Experience 29
Belief 29
Absolute authority 18
Almighty 53
Brahman 58
Charge of partiality on 58
Concept 36
Cosmic creator 9, 53
Eternal reality 19
Everything 72
Formless 23
Governing principle 39
Incarnation of 22 29
Informing power spirit 36
Of Jainism 56
Kingdom of 40
Life, light, love truth 37
Manifestation of 49
Material cause 58
Nature of 35
No two 47
Notion of 44, 66, N
Of scripture
Omnipresent 38
Omnipotent 44, 51
Omniscient 44, 51
Only Entity 47, 48, 49
One without second 47
Personal 41, 94
Real substance 49
Self same 51
Supreme good 37

Term 12, 48
Triumphant 49
Ultimate reality 34, 47, 48, 53, 57, 101
Gods
Agni A
Indra I
Gold 51, 53, 54, 86, 101
Ingot ornament 86
Goldsmith 51
Good 39
Goodness 44, 45
Grace 38, 88
Divine 15
Infinite 88
Of God 16, 52, 90
Greeks 41
Philosophers 10
Gunas 63
See prakruti guna
Rajas, Satva, Tamas
Guru 15, 16
Guide 15
Author's See Bhatt, Jani,

H

H. V. Blavatsky 13, 14, 90
Haldane J. B. S 74, 89
Happiness 21
Harmony 73
Haughtiness 46
Heart 101
Heaven-denizens of 58
Hell denizens of 58
Hindu 17, 72
Scriptures 22
Hinduism 22, 28, 29
History
Of science and philosophy 8
Hope of universal peace 4, 24
Humanity 101
Humility 11
Huxley Aidous A
Hypocrasy 4

I

Ice 49, 50
Idealism 65
Ideal state soul 55
Idol 29, 84
Ignorance 55, 64, 67, 69, 98
Illusionism 80
Illusory 92
Imagination 46, 87
-pious 101
Inanimate objects 50
Incarnation 95
Inconsistency logical 89
Indian Religions R
Indra 52
Ingot 58
Inertia 24, 88
Infidel 23
Inflnite 40, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69 87
Injustice to scriptures 95
Logic 95
Institute oriental O
Institution social 3
Instruments 10
Intellect 50, 65
Intelligeuce 80
Intelligent 38

Intensity 92
Intuition 50
Isher wood christo phen C
Islam 22
Isness 71
J
J. B, S. Haldane H
J. C. Bose B
Jani A. N. 6
Japan 2
Joy 34
Jesus christ C
Judgement 9
Justice 95
K
Karma
As action of different soul 59
Kath-upniśad 16, 40
Ken-upniśad 52, 80
Kevaladvaita 54
See : Absolute Monism also
King has laws 93
Knot 43
Krișṇa Lord 39
Koran 19, 22
L
Laws
Of king 93
Of Contradiction 87
Of Giving and taking 25
Governing the nature 36
Gravitation 37
Karm 56, 59
Kings 93
Thoughts 10, 76, 78, 87
(fandamental)
Letter 32
Liberation 78
Life 34, 36
Multiform 9
Likes 71
Literatare religious 6
Limitations 84
Lincoln Abraham 93, A
Logic 32, 33, 65, 79, 83
Inconsistance 89
Injustice 84
Reasoning 80
Logiciants 43
Lord Krișṇa K
Śankar S
Shiva S
Loss 27
Luxary 88
M
M. S, University (Baroda) 6
Machine 37
Madhvācārya 47, 51, 58
and ācāryas
Mahābhārat 6
Maharaj-Dixitji D
Mahatma Gandhi 27, 36, 37,
38, 39, 40, 41, 87, 94, 101.
Manifestation of
Ultimate Reality 64, 67, 69, U
Manifoldness 66
Master Musician (God) 67
Master 101
Materialism 23, 65
Mathematics 83, 87
Matters 1, 9, 16
Māyā 63, 86

Māyā vāda 8
Memory 9
Men 51
Meutal peace 99
Mind 13, 40, 70, 74
Microscope 43
Misery 40, 56, 58
Missionaries 17
Militant rule 19
Mohammed the prophet 23
Mohammedans 17, 19, 22, 72
Monism-pure 50
Monist 9
Morass 55
Mortality 21
Mosquito 25, 99
Mother the Divine 69

N

Names-diverse D
Nature 28, 91
Nectar veritable 101
Neglect of religion 25
Newton 10
Nirdośa see ultimate Reality
Non-different 92; d
Non-dualism 59
Notes-musical 73
Notion of God 44, 66
Objects 13, 40, 74, 79
  Inanimate 34, 97, 98, 100
  Finite-unreal 69
Obscurity 69
'Occult world' 13, 103
Omnigood [God] 45
Omnipotent [ ,, ] 45, 83, 88, 102
  Almighty 51, 83
Omnipotence 58, 83
Omnipresence of God 45, 102
Omniscient God 11, 45, 51, 102
One absolutely 77
  Without Second 62, 85, 97
Oneness of religion 101
  of law governing 36
Opponents 3
Organs 1, 8, 10, 11
  Sense 8, 10, 11
Organism 1, 51
Oriental institate Baroda 5, I
Origin as single 74
Ovum 74

P

Pains 51
Pantheism 9, 65
Partiality 56, 59
Parmātman 34
Particles Elementary 11
Passages 35, 82
Peace
  After death 21
  Mental 22, 25, 54
  Universal 102
Peacock 73
Perception 9, 92
Permutation combination 73
Perfect 96
Pioneers 3, 20
Philosophers 8, 11, 35, 40, 42, 47, 56, 58, 66, 70, 83, 90
  Greek 10
Philosophy 2, 7, 9, 10, 38
  Vedantic 7
  Western 11

Physical pains 21
Physicists 10
Pleasure 51
Poison 57
Pot and potter 50, 51
Power 12, 13, 44, 69
  Living 36
  Temporal 23
Prakruti Guna G, and R, S, T in
Preachers 21
President, Roosevelt 59
Principle 37, 43, 72, 76, 78
Problems 81
Profit 27
Progress 31, 40, 41, 55
Proffession 23
Proofs 13
Prophet 13, 17, 22, 23
  Mohammed in
Psychological 65
  Entities 50
Psychology 69
Purpose 70
Pure Monism 50, M
Pursuit intellectual 65

Q

Quotient 87
Quotations Quotation Index

R

Radhakrishan S. (Dr) 4, 38, 39
Rational basis 100
Rajas Guna 63
Rāmānujācārya 5, 58, 60, 81, 82, 84
Ramkrishana
  Paramhansa (swami) 11, 29, 84
Raman C. V. (sir) 39
Reason 15, 16, 32, 73, 102
Reality 43, 69, 71, 86
  Ultimate see U
Realism 86
Realisation of God 89
Recapitulation 101
Reproduction 74
Religion 2, 3, 4, 5, 20, 24, 29, 67, 71, 72, 101
  Contribution of
  Conflict of
Religionist 24, 42
Religious persons 3
Religions 4, 17
Relations 26
Revelation 8, 17, 49, 70, 73, 102
Altar of 55
Romain Rolland 1
Roosevelt, Presideut 54
S
Sac cid ānand 70, 71
Saints 22, 28, 42, 101
Sadātman 70
Sādhak 15
Sages 14
Sajātiya 63
Sakti 22
Satva Guna 63
Scriptures 80
Sen sation 65
Second 91
Secret of success 2

Self 23
Self same 50
Seva 88
Simplicity 102
Sincerity 4
Sinneth A. P 13, 103
Śiva 22
Souls 4, 5, 14, 35, 37, 38, 56, 68
Animate 34, 50, 97, 98
Ideal state 55
Inspired 14
Non Sentient 64
Sentient 64
Śruti 9, 35, 54, 71, 77, 78
Conflict of
Passages 79, 81, 82, 95
State of revelation 83
Steam 49, 50
Substance-ultimate 4
Inanimate 50
Śuddhādvaita 10, 34, 35, 50, 54
Vedānt 58, 60, 99, 100, 101
Sun 69, 92
Sūrdāsa 38, 94
Sutra 79
Sutrakar 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 91, 94
Bādarāyan Vyas 13
Surrender 15
Unconditional 27
Śvetāśvataropniśad 16, 42
Śvetketū 42
Svetketūpakhyan 42
System
Religious 5
Theological 35
Vedantic philosophy 6
Swami
Ramkriśna Paramhansa R
Ramtirth R
Vivekānand V

T

Tamas 9, 63
Tattvadip Nibandha 18, 31, 63
Teachers religious 21
Television 2
Theism 65
Theist 41, 56
Theory 10, 59
Thief 26
Trust 15
Truth 29, 32

U

Ultimate Entity 50
" Nature 98
" Principle 8, 12, 13, 22, 39, 43
Ultimate Reality 16, 32, 33, 34. 35, 42, 49, 50, 67, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97.
As god 71
become many 72, 74
Eternal truth 63
Feminine aspect 68
Impartial 79
Independant 63
Master 99
Master musician 67
Nirdosh 56

Omnipotent 0, 63
One without second 62, 78
Source of strength 73
Visualized 69

V

Vallabhācārya 5, 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35, 39, 47, 51, 53, 58, 59, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 99, 100
Arrival at doctrine 35
V's Attitude 32
" Belief 30
" Bhāśya 17
" Dictum 50
" Direct Descendants 6, 7
Faith 88
Justification 89
Minor work 6, 105, A. P. 106 S. R 107–V. D. H
Monistic philosopher 48
Philosophical tenents 7
Vedantācārya 6, 8, 56, 58
Vaishnava 5
Vedic 77
Vedas 18, 22, 29, 30, 32, 33, 50
Authority 18, 42, 47, 49, 89
Vayu 52
Veneration 72
Vested interest 23
View rational 16, 36, V
Vijātiya 63, 9
Viruddha dharmā śraya 84
Vishvamitra 39
Vital 37
Vitthalesa (sri) 99, 100
Vivekānand (swami) 5, 11, 22, 84
Votarics 89
Vyas, Bādarayan 'B'

W

Wars 21
Water 49, 50
Weakness 22, 30
Woman of exquisite beauty 52 [Umā Hemvati Kenopaniśad]
Will 50, 56
Words eternal 29, 32
World modification of U. Reality 54
Play 98
Worship 72
Worshipper 22, 30

Y

You 24
Yogins 24

Z

Zeal false 101 F
Zero 87

## INDEX OF INALATIONS


A

Acintyā khalu 83 111/30

Atati vyāpnoti 38

Ātmaṣṛṣter na Vaiṣamyam 59

Auml Brahmavādino Vadanti 42

B

Bhidyate hṛdaya granthi 43

Buddhi Prerak 39

C-D-E

Ekamevā 78, 91

F, G, I. J, K

Kaścid dirah 40, 75

Kāṣthe na vidyate 72

Katham asatah sat jāyeta 86

L

Lokavat tu Lilā-kaivalyam 96

N

Nā-gner hi tāpo 60

Na Cakṣusa 75

Napi vacā 75

Na caikam 77

Niṣkalam-niṣkriyam 79

P

Paratantro hyapekśate 52

Prakaśaśraye 91

Prayatna Paryantam 88

S

Sad eva Saumya 35, 47, 77, 81, 85, 90

Sa ātmanam 53

Samoham sarva 58

Sarvabhāve samarth 50

Sarva dharm 95

Śraddhāmayo'yam 88

Śruteś tu 79, 83

Śvetketo 42

Suneri maine..38

T

Tad aikṣata 35, 85, 95

Tad dure 76

Tad ha eka 41

V

Vasudev sarvam 71

Y

Yadā 95

Yam labdhvā 43

Yato vācho 70


The source may be referrered from the page numbers given here

## PROVERBS AND NUMINOUS

'But the same religion 2, 109
A Faith cannot 4, 109
The First Step 9
Get on or Get out 26
God has Sent 6, 109
God helps the helpless 39

I
I accept all religious 5, 109
It is not the human...15, 30
defects of Guru
It is faith that steers 27
It in not wisdom 46
I give this example show how thing works 33
Knowledge is power 44
Little learning 46
Man first looks out 35
More things 94
Necessity knows no laws 26
No trusting 10, 27, 46
A Person 16
Parable of blind & lame 44
Proceeding to search 12
Salutation to any form 22
Substance is one 22
There is an indefinable 36
There is not to reason why 30
Thus was child's play 14
Though religions many 101
Variety is the species of life 12
We think before 98
Where everything fails 28
Worshippers of any deity 22
Sources may be referred from the page numbers given here

BRAHMAVADA

RAGHUNATH SHARMA